School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1404172

THE CHURCH AND HER PROBLEMS

J. E. WATTS-DITCHFIELD D.D.
LORD BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD

THE CHURCH AND HER PROBLEMS

THE CHURCH AND HER PROBLEMS

BEING THE

CHARGE AT HIS PRIMARY VISITATION

BY THE RIGHT REV.

J. E. WATTS-DITCHFIELD, D.D.

BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD

Author of "Here and Hereafter," "Fishers of Men," "Church in Action," "Reservation," etc.

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT

ROXBURGHE HOUSE

PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

MCMXX

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

TO
MY DIOCESE
WHICH
GOD HAS SENT ME TO SERVE

FOREWORD

THE Charge was delivered at six centres, Colchester, Halstead, Southend, Chelmsford, Bishop's Stortford and West Ham, during May, 1920. In a few places slight alterations and some omissions were made. Although compelled to refer to irregularities, small and great, the Bishop desires to recognize publicly and emphatically the loyalty and devotion of the overwhelming majority of the clergy. He trusts and prays that God may bless the Diocese with unity, progress and, above all, with the fullness of the Holy Spirit.

P.S. Between the delivery of the Charge and its publication the Lambeth Conference was held, and the Bishop would refer to his Presidential Address at the Southend Church Congress as expanding or modifying some of the statements made in his Charge.

The Early Tractarians have been quoted largely so that a comparison may be drawn between their views and those of some of their successors.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I	THE CHURCH WITHIN THE DIOCESE . .	9
	History — Extent — Complexity — Tithes — Use and Abuse of Money.	
II	THE CHURCH AND HER GOVERNMENT . .	35
	Enabling Act—Comparison of Communicants and Electors—Parochial Church Council—Wardens' Duties—Reasons for lack of Discipline—Synods.	
III	THE CHURCH AND HER SERVICES . . .	53
	Authority—Powers of National Churches—Tractarians' Position—Authority by Bishops—Unlawful Omissions —Lack of Quiet in Services—Holy Baptism—Confirmees, their Age, Preparation and After-Care—Reservation—Benediction and Devotions—Public Worship.	
IV	THE CHURCH AND SOME OF THE PROBLEMS BEFORE HER	103
	Labour—Temperance — Sex — Housing—Sunday—Recreation Intellectual — Modernism — Reunion—Women's Sphere.	
V	THE CHURCH AND HER MISSION . . .	150
	Evangelistic—Among Men—Women—Open-air — The Young—Day and Sunday Schools—In Country Areas.	
VI	THE BASIS OF ALL SUCCESSFUL WORK . .	175
	Private Prayer and Intercession—Holy Scripture—Confession—Fasting.	

THE CHURCH AND HER PROBLEMS

CHAPTER I

THE CHURCH WITHIN THE DIOCESE

MY BRETHREN OF THE CLERGY AND OF THE LAITY,—

The Primary Visitation of a Bishop is always important. When it is also the first Visitation within a new Diocese it becomes one of historical interest, marking, as it must, for all time the condition of life and work in the earliest stages of its existence. May this one also be remembered for the blessing vouchsafed during it and following it.

There is no more ancient institution in Essex than the Church. It has an origin of which it may be well proud and thankful to possess. The names of the earliest disciples are unknown, but excavations in Butt Lane Cemetery at Colchester revealed that, in the days of the Roman occupation, men had been interred in wooden coffins with their plain Latin Cross with bevelled edge, a sign denoting the burial of a Christian. One of the most interesting events

in the life of the Church during this year (1920) will be the rededication of the little Church of St. Peter, Bradwell, at the mouth of the Blackwater. This in itself will illustrate our long and glorious history and yet humble beginning. It will speak to us of St. Cedd, and how Sigebert of Essex, impressed by what he had heard of the claims and power of the new faith, (and yet possibly fearful of its embassies, hailing from across the water and established at Canterbury and Rochester, comparatively near at hand), sends a message to far-off Northumbria, asking its King, Oswy, to send him Christian teachers. Then St. Cedd, receiving his ordination at the hands of the illustrious Finian and two other Northumbrian Bishops, established himself in Essex in 654, and at St. Peter's and at Tilbury he trained his bands of converts to become missionaries to carry the message and to plant the Cross in the villages and towns of our county. The churches of Ashingdon, Greenstead and Waltham Abbey testify to the excellency of their work, for they are evidence of the vitality of the Church long before the Norman Conquest. The pastoral staff which I carry as the symbol of my office speaks to us through the figures on its panels of St. Cedd, St. Ethelburga and St. Osyth, saints of our Church, who laid its foundations on the Christ and on no other.

I trust that the story of Essex Christianity may some day be written in popular language, so that Church people may rejoice the more in the heritage which they possess. Changes in administration

during the centuries were inevitable, and so in turn the Church in Essex formed part of the Diocese of London, Rochester and St. Albans.

The growth of London-over-the-Border and many other causes rendered it impossible for any Bishop, however energetic, to work this Diocese in conjunction with Hertfordshire, and so its division was carefully considered and was finally effected. The name of Bishop Jacob will be for ever associated with the formation of the Diocese. We thank God for what he was and for what he did, and trust that we may be found worthy of carrying on the work which he so well began.

May I add, after six years' experience, that I am not prepared to advocate or to approve a further division of the Diocese. Many reasons for this opinion might be given, but I will name two :—

1. Any further division would divide Essex practically into—(*a*) a town area embracing London-over-the-Border area, enlarged to a considerable extent ; (*b*) a rural area with small towns in its midst. It would follow therefore :—

(*a*) That the Bishop of the town area would be unable to move incumbents of large town parishes when age or health made it impossible for them to continue to work them with benefit to the Church. He would have no country parishes to send them where they might for years render excellent service. This in itself would be a real hindrance to the work.

(*b*) That the financial position of such a town area would become almost untenable. We have

realized what the loss of Hertfordshire has meant to the Diocese, and without the help of the rest of Essex I do not think that the Church in London-over-the-Border area could fulfil her mission.

2. Essex is self-contained. It is no small advantage to the Church that its boundaries coincide with the county area. The advantages are obvious to all who really know the inner work of the Church. The separation from the town area would tend, I fear, to take away from the rural area a stimulus and a broadened outlook which often is so difficult to preserve in the tiny parishes. Therefore for some time to come, at any rate, the Diocese will remain geographically as it is. It may be necessary to re-arrange the boundaries of various rural deaneries and also to create a new archdeaconry to meet the claims of the rapidly increasing population, but I am convinced that the present arrangement, which places the Diocesan in the centre of the Diocese, with an Episcopal colleague in the north and another in the south, is, although perhaps not ideal, the best possible for to-day.

When I was consecrated your Bishop on St. Matthias' Day, 1914, I began to dream dreams and to formulate plans for the work in the new Diocese, but alas! the war clouds gathered and they were useless. It is impossible to realize what the war has meant to the Church in Essex. She has lost the services of some of her brightest lads. We shall suffer loss for generations. These men, young in years, but pure in heart and keen in spirit, whom I

saw during the first six months of my Episcopate, in the choirs of our churches, teaching the lads in our Sunday schools, marshalling our Lads' Brigade and our Scouts, were those whom I hoped some day to be the "pillars" of our Church. They have ceased to belong to the Church "Militant" and have left her the weaker for their loss and yet nerved by their heroism, their sacrifice and yea, by their death, to go on with her work for God and the Church in the spirit which animated them on the battlefields of Flanders, of Gallipoli, and nay, even at the very gates of the Holy City itself. Essex may well be proud and thankful for the record of her sons during the war. The bodies of Captain Fryatt and Jack Cornwell both lie in Essex soil, but the spirit which was in them was found in tens of thousands of men of Essex blood, and as I pass from village to village or go through crowded streets, I glory in the fact that from every one of them men went to do their duty to God, to King and country. Their influence will be felt in the days that are to come. We, as a Church, prayed for them and we leave those who have fallen in the hands of their Father and ours in the sure and certain hope of the Resurrection.

I cannot refrain from publicly expressing my deep sense of gratitude to my more immediate colleagues in the work. Of Bishop Stevens we are all proud and thankful. His long and devoted service within and without the Church have made him known as the Grand Old Man of Essex. The Bishop of

Colchester is known to all of you as one in whom you can trust. To me, he has been the personification of loyalty and of helpful service. Already the Bishop of Barking is impressing his area by the vigour and untiring energy with which he throws himself into his work, and I look forward with hope to his ministry among us. It is impossible to mention even the names of those who devote their life and all their power to the work of the Church. But I must name Canon Bayne, Canon Steele and Sir Montague Turner as men who are rendering great services to the Church, and also the twenty-nine Rural Deans, who have been indeed of the greatest possible service to me and to their brethren, both clergy and laity alike.

We have now to face the future and fulfil our destiny as a Diocese. I am thankful that there are distinct signs of the growth of the Diocesan spirit in our midst. The National Mission in 1916 did much to foster and increase this spirit. The clergy visited each other's parishes, formed friendships and above all received spiritual gifts as they met together in Retreats to the number of over six hundred. Still much remains to be done. Town and country priests must each realize they are not a class apart, but all in one common ministry. Laymen must realize that belief in a Catholic Church does not mean in practice belief merely in the Parish Church. We must all learn to cultivate the broader view, that the Diocese and not the parish is the centre of our Church life. The symbol of the Diocese is

manifestly the Cathedral, and Chelmsford ought to be known to every Church man, woman and child in the Diocese. I look forward to the time when it will be possible for excursions to be arranged, not merely from London-over-the-Border, but from every tiny village to the Cathedral town. But we must remember that as yet the grand old Parish Church of Chelmsford has not been adapted to the purposes of a Cathedral. When a suitable opportunity presents itself (and I hope such an opportunity may not be long delayed), I trust that we may see the excellent plans of Sir Charles Nicholson carried through, and Canon Lake, to whom the Diocese owes so much, given the joy of ministering in a building worthy of being the centre of the worship of the Diocese. When such a time arrives I know I can count upon the Diocese as a whole taking their share in this important work.

To turn now to the Visitation itself. Formerly the Bishop's Visitation implied a personal visit to every parish. But in a Diocese with close upon five hundred parishes within it, this course is well-nigh impossible to adopt. But this I do not entirely regret. It has been my happy privilege to visit almost every parish in the Diocese, some of the smallest as well as the largest, and during my visits to learn much concerning the work of the clergy, as to their difficulties, their failures, and, thank God, in many cases for the success which has attended their ministry. But I have been loath to make my visit in any sense official. I wanted to come to the

clergy as their Father-in-God and to them and their people as a friend, and I have, therefore, hesitated to seek for information such as that which should be obtained when a formal Visitation is made. To many of you the questions may have seemed too many, some unnecessary, and some almost inquisitorial in character, but it is surely right and imperative the Bishop ought to make himself acquainted with what is done in every Parish Church in his Diocese and whether the pastoral work is done in the spirit of the high ideals expressed in the Ordinal. No parish priest ought to conduct any service in his church about which he is unwilling that his Bishop should know.

But all the questions have been asked, not as by a judge or as an embassy from Scotland Yard, but by one who has striven to be known as your Father-in-God. It is in that spirit that I asked for the information, and it is in that spirit that I shall now deal with your replies to my inquiries.

Some of the subjects on which I shall speak are important at the moment, others will affect the policy and work of the Church in the days that are to come. Among the former may I name three :—

(*a*) The Church Congress, which will be held at Southend from October 19 to 22. The Congress this year will have a special importance, following as it will the Lambeth Conference and coming just before the meeting of the National Church Assembly in the autumn. May I earnestly appeal to clergy

and laity alike to arrange so that during that week the ordinary meetings in their parishes may be suspended. A great opportunity will be lost if, for the sake of ordinary work, clergy or church officials miss the Congress. All wardens and other lay-workers should endeavour to be present. I trust we may have a record attendance from within the Diocese.

(*b*) The Lambeth Conference will be held in July, and nearly three hundred Bishops in connexion with the Anglican Communion will be present. Although this gathering has no legal status or legal power its decisions naturally will have great moral weight and will vitally affect the Church for years to come.

(*c*) The Diocesan means of communication. The Diocesan Chronicle issued every month is the official means by which the Bishop communicates to the Diocese his wishes and directions. I earnestly ask you all to send your subscription of half-a-crown to the Earls Colne Printing Press and thus keep in touch with the work and thought of the whole Diocese.

I intend during my Visitation to draw your attention to our work in the Diocese and its connexion with the larger work of the Church outside under six different heads, viz. :—

1. The Church within the Diocese.
2. The Church and her Government.
3. The Church and her services.
4. The Church and some of the Problems before her.

5. The Church and her Mission.
6. The Church and the Basis of all her Work.

THE CHURCH WITHIN THE DIOCESE.—There are few Dioceses of such a complex character as that of Chelmsford. It is usual to divide it roughly into the London-over-the-Border area and the rural area, but this division does not adequately describe the real nature of the Diocese. Let me briefly bring it before you. One of the greatest networks of docks in the world lies along its river boundary with all that such a fact implies. The steady, reliable working class are found living close to slumland, squalor and wretchedness. Hundreds of streets mostly alike, rows and rows of houses teeming with human life, stretch for miles from east to west. Other districts, once occupied by persons of wealth, are now let, sublet, and again sublet. Within their reach is the wonderfully beautiful Epping Forest, the greatest boon which East London possesses, and near it, and within it, the suburban centres of Loughton, Woodford, Buckhurst Hill and Epping. But again the estuary of the Thames and the great North Sea lying on the south and east of our boundaries have caused the rise of watering places varied in character and in size. Southend, the nearest seaside resort to London, has grown from a small village to be the second largest town of its kind in England, having even surpassed Blackpool, the famous resort of Lancashire. How different is Frinton-on-Sea with its villas and its

golf, while Clacton and Walton, each with its own peculiar characteristics, call to dwellers in town and country to come to them for health and strength. Harwich, unique within our borders, is known as one of our most famous naval bases, while the little islands of Foulness, Canvey, Wallasea, and of Osea afford yet further proof of the complex character of our Diocese. The military stations of Colchester and of Warley, in peace as well as in war, have taught us something of our duty to the British soldier. The scores of little villages, whose only inhabitants till the soil, remind us that England is not even yet a mere land of towns, and the country towns of Saffron Walden and of Maldon present many of the old-world characteristics so absent from our modern towns. Chelmsford, not only the centre of the county but of the Diocese, is rapidly becoming more than an ordinary country town by employing thousands of men and women in the great works which have arisen there within the past few years. From this brief sketch it will be seen that the problems of the Church with regard to her work are many and varied in character, and that in this Diocese there is, to an extraordinary degree, a call for variety of operations. I have striven, during the last six years, to make myself acquainted with them, and as far as possible to guide the Diocese as a whole, and individual parishes in particular, to understand them to some extent and to find some solution of them, however partial it may be. As some help towards this object I have launched the

effort known as the Bishop of Chelmsford's Crusade.

Briefly its object may be stated as an effort to put the Church in the Diocese in an efficient position with regard to its plant and its machinery. There are great arrears to be made up and wide extensions to be made before the Church can be said to be equipped for her work, and this applies, in varying degree, to every part of the Diocese, town, country and seaside alike. May I bring them in this order before you?

(1) *The problems in the town area and especially in London-over-the-Border with a population of close upon one million.*—In doing so I must bear my testimony to the enormous obligation under which the Diocese lies to the fund which bears that name, and to the devoted men, such as Canon Procter and Canon Bayne, who have made it what it is. I cannot imagine what the condition of Church life in this great area would have been if this great fund had not been launched and maintained. The work which it has done directly has been great, but it is no exaggeration to say that its indirect influence, suggestion and inspiration have done much more. The stimulus to local effort, the encouragement given to clergy, combined with its effort to keep ever to the front the spiritual ideal, has been of incalculable benefit to the Church, far greater than can be expressed in any balance-sheet of receipts and expenditure. I regret that, notwithstanding the noble efforts made by those responsible for the fund, and the great work for which it was responsible, the

income has practically remained stationary for many years. Ten years ago, in 1909, its receipts were £14,513, rising to £15,500 in 1912, but in 1913 (the last year before the division of the Diocese) they dropped to £13,093, while last year, 1919, or six years later, they were only £8 less, being £13,085. At the same time the investments, owing to legacies, have risen from £17,110 10*s.* at the time of the division of the Diocese to £45,192 3*s.* 6*d.* at the present time. It was hoped, before the division took place, that Church people in Hertfordshire would continue to realize their responsibility to the area from which they were parted from a Diocesan point of view, but to which they were still linked by the common bond of the Church. Although we gratefully acknowledge the continued assistance of many friends, the total help from that rich county is by no means what was anticipated or what we feel we have a right to expect. Notwithstanding all that has been done in London-over-the-Border, a commission which I appointed reported to me a condition of affairs which I venture to think shows that there is no area of a similar size anywhere in England where the Church is so ill equipped for her task as in London-over-the-Border, and this applies to lack of churches, halls, vicarages and, above all, of an adequate staff of clergy and lay-workers. The commission, after a thorough and systematic inquiry, recommended that a scheme should be taken in hand and carried through at the earliest moment for the erection of eleven new permanent churches, thirteen vicarages,

twenty-nine mission churches, thirty halls, the purchase of seventeen sites, the completion of thirteen churches and the enlargement of two others. It is estimated that at *least* a quarter of a million must be raised for this purpose alone. Since their report was received the situation has become even more difficult and our responsibilities have enormously increased. The London County Council has decided to build an entirely new town, larger than Southampton, up to date and according to the recommendations made by different commissions, and in fact to erect a "model" town, the cost of which may reach the enormous sum of thirty million pounds. The Church must step in at the beginning to secure the best sites or she will never be able to occupy any position at all within the town. I have therefore applied for ten sites, and have decided on the formation of ten new parishes, with the full equipment of churches, institutes, vicarages and staff. Can this scheme, at present rates, be carried through for less than three hundred thousand pounds? Yet, is there a Churchman, priest or layman who does not realize that it must be undertaken? We dare not allow a new town such as is proposed to develop with no church, no services and no priest. But this does not complete our responsibility. The City of London Corporation are about to expend over two millions on house-building, all in Essex, and other schemes almost equally great are about to be launched, so that altogether we are faced suddenly with a problem probably unparalleled in the history of the Church of England.

(2) *Seaside Problems.*—I have referred to Southend. I gladly recognize the good work which has been done and is being done in this great seaside resort, but, as the commission lately appointed has reported to me, Church effort and aggression is hindered on all sides by her lack of plant and of equipment. At least one hundred thousand pounds will be required if the arrears are to be made up, and the Church is to be given the opportunity she ought to possess of influencing the civil, social and recreative life of the borough. The fact is that the town has grown too rapidly for the problems of the Church to be solved entirely by local effort.

But in addition to the problem of Southend, steps have been taken, or are being taken, to deal with the growing necessities of Frinton-on-Sea, where the need of a new church is imperative, with Clacton, where the work so well begun at St. James's requires the expenditure of many thousands to bring it to a successful conclusion, while at no distant date Church life at Walton and other centres will demand more careful consideration. On the general question of work at the seaside, I commend a small but useful book entitled *Problems of Pleasure Towns*, edited by Canon Dormer Pierce, Vicar of Brighton, and formerly Rural Dean of Southend, and published by the S.P.C.K. It is both timely and suggestive.

I now turn to Church work in country parishes, and some of its difficulties :—

First with regard to the clergy. It is certain that

at no distant date the whole problem of country parishes will have to be reviewed in all its bearings. Drastic and far-reaching changes are inevitable. My concern is lest these changes should be carried through hastily and without due consideration of the complex nature of Church life in the country districts. The system by which every parish has its own church and its own incumbent in its midst has had a far greater influence on English life than is sometimes supposed, and before this system is destroyed or greatly modified, we must be convinced that what is suggested to take its place is likely to produce better results and be more permanently successful than that which it supplants. The Union of Benefices Act passed last year will shortly be put in operation. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners have taken steps to hold inquiries, through their officials, in every part of the Diocese, and when they are held I hope that every interest will be considered, and that clergy and laity alike will strive to take a broad and comprehensive view of the situation and not meet the Commission in any narrow and prejudiced spirit. That there is a waste of man-power in the country is evident, and it is equally true that there is a shortage of clergy in the towns. As to how the latter can be remedied without injury to the work in the former is the problem to be solved. We must not forget the fact that the conditions of life in the scattered country districts require a larger percentage of clergy to the population than is necessary in the town areas.

Yet consider that, for instance, Newport deanery has fourteen clergy to a population of about ten thousand, while the whole of East Ham parish, with fifty-two thousand population, over five times as much, has only five clergy. Similar figures might be produced from many quarters illustrative of the difference of man-power which the Church has in the country compared with that in the towns. But to decide the union of benefices simply on the basis of population would be folly and end possibly in a state of affairs worse than that which now exists.

But whatever the size of the parish the incumbent must be paid an adequate stipend. This may be achieved partly by the proposed union of benefices and partly by a scheme inaugurated by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for the augmentation of benefices. I advise all who desire to be acquainted with the work done by that body to purchase a little book costing 1*s.* called *The Ecclesiastical Commission* by Sir Lewis Dibden and published by Macmillan. May I also remind incumbents with an income of less than £340 per year of the scheme by which, this year, the Commissioners will render them substantial help? Also Queen Anne's Bounty has formulated a scheme for assistance regarding dilapidations.

If any incumbent is in doubt concerning either matter he should communicate with the secretary of either of those bodies. In London-over-the-Border area some improvement has taken place with regard to the stipends of the unbeneficed clergy and

lay-workers. In 1914 there were 116 curates receiving less than £200 per annum. To-day there are only nineteen. In 1914 only three curates received £200 or more; to-day there are eighty-one. In 1914 thirteen lay-readers received less than £90, while to-day no one receives less than that amount, but fourteen lay-readers are receiving sums from £100 to £200 per year. The position of women workers has greatly improved. In 1914 thirteen were receiving less than £50 per year. To-day no one is receiving such a stipend, while thirty-four are receiving over £80, of whom eighteen are receiving over £100 and nine over £110. In several cases the stipends of incumbents have been increased, but much more remains to be done before the Church is clear of the charge of employing "sweated" labour.

TITHE.—I desire now to speak on a question of real importance, and one which at the present time is the subject of much controversy, and which is the cause of real hardship upon the clergy by thrusting upon them a percentage of rates for which there is no ground whatever. I refer to tithe rent, but before doing so it may be well if I make a few observations concerning tithes themselves. I fear that many labour under a misapprehension concerning their origin and their connexion with the State.

Strictly speaking, the Church of England, as a whole and as a corporate body, has no endowments. But each Bishopric, chapter, and incumbency is

endowed and is entitled to the income of certain property, frequently consisting of land. Some grants of land go back to the earliest days of our history. For instance, as far back as A.D. 609, St. Paul's Cathedral was granted land at Tillingham in Essex. These lands, even though they were granted by the King, were seldom if ever the common property of the nation, but were granted by him in the private capacity of a territorial landowner. Much of the land was granted to the Church by ordinary landowners. The motives which prompted the gifts cannot interfere with the Church's legal right to them. Other nobles gave lands to their favourites or mistresses, and their successors hold them notwithstanding the origin of their title. The right to hold these lands depends solely upon whether the present owner can show a legal title to them.

Tithes originated as a free-will offering, but gradually became the normal rule until certain canons laid down the payment as a duty. Tithes received State recognition at the Council of Chelsea as long ago as 787, when the Witenagemot laid it down as a moral and religious duty that care should be taken to pay the tenth of all possessions. At this Council no destination for the value was pointed out, but gradually the landowners appropriated the tithe to the maintenance of the parish priest. Then the legal right to tithe became complete.

Tithe is wrongly spoken of as a tax, but it is *property*. On this point Sir William Harcourt said in the House of Commons in 1894: "The hon.

member speaks of tithes, repeating the usual fallacy that they are a tax upon land. But they are nothing of the kind. Every one who has bought land has paid a less price for it in consequence of its being chargeable with tithe." Or again, to quote Lord Chancellor Selborne's clear statement: "Tithes never entered into, or were never granted out of the general public revenue. The tithe has been for ages real property by law. Its nature has been the same, whether in the hands of ecclesiastical or lay tithe-owners."

Thus it is seen that tithe is in the nature of rent, and not of a tax to keep the parson. For instance, in Wales, where the Church has been disestablished, not a single farmer pays less tithe. He pays just as much as he ever did, but he pays it to somebody else, and if in England the tithe ceased to be paid to the vicar or rector, the farmer would still have to pay it to some one else. In other words, the farmer has two landlords who divide the rent between them, the one from whom he rents the farm, and the other the parson.

The endowments (although it is true that the bulk of them were given before Nonconformity had arisen) are still being used for the benefit of every one, for the Church is national in its operation, and every parishioner has a right to a seat in his Parish Church and to the ministrations. So that the frequent objection on the part of dissenting farmers to pay tithe has no legal or even moral grounds of support. The land belongs to the Church

by right of property, just as it does in other cases to the descendants of ancient families of the land.

But while the payment of tithes is clearly in accordance with right and justice, there is another matter connected with tithe which affects the clergy unjustly. I refer to the payment by them of what is known as the tithe rent charge. Those clergy whose incomes are derived from tithe suffer under the anomalous burden of having to pay rates upon the whole of their professional income—a double burden of taxation which weighs upon no other professional man. That the present system is unjust is seen from the statement of Sir Arthur Griffith Boscawen, the Government Minister in charge of the new Bill. He says: "A very strong case could be made out for the total exemption of tithe rent charge attached to benefice from rating."

A further injustice arose when the tithe was fixed in 1918 at 109, but the incumbent was compelled to pay on the soaring rates on the same basis as before. This is rightly resented by the clergy. They are bearing a burden different in kind from that of any other body of tax or rate payers in the land. The Government has now introduced a Bill which passed its second reading on April 21st without a division, but it does not remedy the injustice excepting partially, and it can be by no means accepted as offering a final solution of the difficulty. Continuous efforts must be made until the Government accepts the principle that the clergy must be rated only in the manner and on the lines of every

other ratepayer in the parish. I know that local Assessment Committees have their duties to perform, but I trust that they will deal as generously and as fairly with the assessment of the clergy as they can, remembering the great difficulty of the whole situation. The Bishops have been blamed, and in some cases almost wild accusations have been made regarding their action, but speaking for them and for myself, I would say that this matter has received and is receiving our constant attention. We have felt that we could do more good and be more likely to achieve our purpose by quiet and unostentatious methods, than by public demonstrations, and this has perhaps fostered the idea that we were indifferent to the burden placed upon the clergy and that we were taking no steps to remove it, but I can assure you that we shall continue to combat the gross injustice under which the clergy are suffering until it is finally removed.

But the question of the stipend of the clergy is only partly affected by the tithe and is one of the greatest importance. Church people as a whole have treated this matter with an apathy and indifference in the past which has resulted in scandal to the Church, and has tended to weaken the ministry of many of her priests by placing upon them a financial burden too great for them to bear and at the same time give of their best to their work. Yet the clergy are the men of God sent into parishes as the ambassadors of Christ. Surely the Church ought to count it as a great honour to minister to

their needs. The day of starvation, of semi-starvation and of doles must end and the men who preach the Gospel must *live* of the Gospel. Much more can be done locally than is being done, and one of the first duties which ought to be undertaken by the Parochial Church Council is that of devising some scheme by which this scandal is removed and the clergy dealt with in a manner worthy of their office and *work*.

May I draw your attention to the financial efforts made by the Central Board of Finance and our own Diocesan Board? The Central Board of Finance has done much already for the benefit of the Church, and deserves the practical sympathy of all Church people. Whether the support given to it will be sufficient to enable it to fulfil its purpose concerning such problems as pensions, training for the ministry, and dilapidations remains uncertain. With regard to our own Board of Finance, I am grateful for the support which it has received, and yet I do not regard it as adequate or what we have a right to expect. What are the facts? Since and including the year 1915, the Board has asked the Diocese to raise £8,200 per year, for certain purposes, all of real importance and making for Diocesan efficiency and progress. All Church people in Essex were expected to take a share in raising this sum, which meant a little over half-a-crown per year from all those Church people who communicate at Easter—rich and poor. This was surely not too large a sum to expect to receive for Diocesan work, and yet it was not given!

In 1915 the sum raised was £5,577 instead of £8,200, or only 68·01 per cent of the sum asked for. Last year, after four years, the figures were better, but only slightly so. They were £6,011, or 73·10 per cent. Can this be considered satisfactory? It may be asked, "What is the relationship between the Bishop's Crusade and the Board of Finance and the London-over-the-Border Fund?" Let me put the matter briefly. All over the Diocese the Church requires new plant, new machinery. The Crusade has undertaken to supply it, but when the new parishes have been created, new churches and institutes built, they will have to be maintained and staffed, and this will be the continued work of the Board of Finance and of the London-over-the-Border Fund. I regret to say that last year no less than fifty-five parishes did not contribute anything at all to the Board of Finance. There is no excuse for this. No parish can continue its work without Diocesan help. It is through the Diocese, by the Bishop, that parishioners are confirmed, and it is by the same means that new incumbents are instituted and clergy are licensed to officiate in their churches. I ask all clergy and wardens to realize their common responsibility in this matter. It is useless for either clergy or people to profess they are part of the Church of England and yet all the time separate themselves from the main body and act purely as if they were Congregationalists. The fact is that Church people are suffering from the generosity of their forefathers. In parish after

parish they worship in a church built for them centuries ago, and towards the erection of which, consequently, they never contributed a penny, and yet when asked to contribute towards the erection of a new church in some populous area they decline to do so, expressing the opinion that the people on the spot should find all the necessary money! The question of giving for the work of God requires careful attention. Money is one of the most powerful influences in the world, and yet we rarely teach people to use it. They seldom have any guiding principle put before them to control the expenditure of their income. I wonder how often Church people have been exhorted to pray for guidance respecting the use of money whether of large or small amount. Do they not spend it largely on impulse and without any idea that by doing so they are misusing a talent entrusted by God for the furtherance of His Kingdom? It will be well if more sermons on the subject, apart from appealing for funds, can be preached, and if the question on the broad lines of principle could be considered and discussed by the Parochial Church Council. But the county will not be won to God by finance, and important as the question is it must not be allowed to become the subject of primary consideration in any of our Assemblies. The real strength of the Church lies in her ability to fulfil her Lord's command. The Apostle, possessing neither silver nor gold, worked miracles, and so the Church in her days of poverty gained ground because she possessed the soul-converting power.

On another occasion I shall deal with the Church and her Mission, and therefore I will close my address by saying that the Church within the Diocese has a responsibility, great and almost overwhelming. It is responsible for the souls of men and women for whom her Lord died. He has commissioned the Church to win Essex for Christ. Is she fulfilling it? What saith the Spirit unto the Church of Chelmsford? May God give us ears to hear His voice, but above all the ready will to obey and the heart so full of love to God and man that by our life and work men are saved through Christ for ever.

CHAPTER II

THE CHURCH AND HER GOVERNMENT

THE Church is the oldest institution in the country, and it would be surprising if, in the course of centuries, much of her machinery had not become antiquated and out of date. The words "the Established Church" require explanation and interpretation. Frequently they convey the impression that the Church was established or even created by an Act of Parliament, whereas the Church was firmly established in the land long before the first King of England ascended the throne or the first Parliament assembled, and Parliament simply recognized the Church as Established and treated her as such. In the days when the Church alone represented the religious instinct and faith of all Christians in the land, and when all the members of both Houses of Parliament were members of the Church, it came about that, practically, the Church was governed through Convocation and her Synods, in which Bishops and priests assembled, and by the Houses of Parliament, which really formed the House of Laymen for the Church.

The growth of Nonconformity, including the Roman Catholic Church, led to the opening of the doors of Parliament to men who were not members of the Church. As a result of this change the difficulty of any wise, full and efficient alteration in the administration and discipline of the Church became increasingly great, until it seemed almost impossible to hope for any real and adequate improvement so long as every reform required by the Church had, of necessity, to pass through each House of Parliament a first, a second Reading, a Committee stage, Report, and a final or third Reading. This impasse led, upon the issue of the Report of the Church and State Committee, to the adoption by the Representative Church Council of the Bill, commonly called the Enabling Bill, which by God's blessing was passed by both Houses of Parliament and has become the law of the land.

The Enabling Act in itself does nothing to reform abuses or to alter any single department of Church life. It leaves the Church exactly as she was before, except that it enables the Church to formulate the reforms she desires, and on the other hand enables Parliament by an easy process and without undue loss of time to carry into law the reform which the Church desires. If the Church is cold and apathetic, then she will not use the powers which the Act bestows upon her, while on the other hand, if the Church is keen and alert to use the possibilities which the Act opens out to her, then a glorious era of reform is before us. The Act entrusts

the National Church Assembly with the right to formulate any Bill dealing with any phase of Church life, and the Bill can be passed and become law by its being presented to each House on only one occasion. The gain to the Church by this arrangement is great, and throws upon Church people a great responsibility. The task of forming the Roll of Electors has been generally well done, although I regret that in seventeen parishes no Roll has been formed; but several of these were without incumbents at the time, and no doubt a Roll will be formed in due course. The following figures are suggestive :—

	Communicants.	On Roll.
Archdeaconry of Essex . . .	53,596	62,150
Archdeaconry of Colchester . .	19,348	33,375
Asylums, Poor Law, etc. . .	1,924	—
	74,868	95,525

The total number of Parliamentary electors for Essex is 611,799, compared with 95,525 on the Church Roll, or roughly one in six or one in fourteen of the total population.

I do not think any organization other than the Church could have formed such a Roll so successfully. If the State in forming her Roll of Electors had compelled persons to sign a roll and make certain declarations before becoming entitled to vote for Parliament, I wonder what proportion of the population in either town or country would be found on the list of voters to-day. Yet we must aim at making the Roll as large and as influential as possible.

Church Councils.—It must be remembered that, as yet, Church Councils have no real power. The Easter Vestry Meeting holds exactly the same position as ever and the control and work of the churchwardens stands precisely as it did. In the autumn the National Church Assembly will decide what powers the Council should possess. For centuries the incumbent has been practically the benevolent autocrat of the parish, insomuch that there was really no effective control other than his own. In many parishes, owing largely to the personality and spiritual power of the incumbent, the parish has not only not suffered, but has even gained in consequence. But it cannot be denied that the day for such a situation is past. The laity must have a larger control than they have possessed and their interest must be increased by added responsibility and power. This may cause, in the beginning of the new era, difficulties of many kinds, but I am convinced that, in the great majority of parishes, both incumbents and Councils will approach the new situation with good will and with a sincere desire to work together in complete harmony for the well-being of the Church so dear to both. I think it is certain that among the powers with which the National Assembly will seek to clothe the Parochial Church Council will be that of the control of the financial side of the Church's life. I hope, however, that this will not simply mean that the Council will become the corporate critic of every item of expenditure suggested or incurred by the incumbent, but

rather that the Council will realize its obligation to raise all the sums necessary for the adequate work of the Church. It is certain that the Council will also have a voice in, but not the control of, the way in which the services in the Church are conducted. The loss which the Church has sustained by the arbitrary alteration in its services by the incumbent has been incalculable. The new rubric in the proposed revised Prayer Book clearly gives the parishioner an appeal to the Bishop on this, to them, most important matter. I think it likely that drastic changes will be made regarding patronage, and that the parishioners, through their Councils, will have a voice in the appointment of a new incumbent. Therefore, although at present the Councils possess no authority and no powers except with regard to the care and compilation of the Electoral Roll, they are likely in the near future to be a most important factor in the life of every church in the land. But in my opinion the Parochial Church Council will prove a great hindrance to the work of the Church and cause friction, begetting weakness rather than strength, unless it is clearly recognized from the beginning that it is not called into being merely to deal with finance, but that it is intended to become the most spiritual body in connexion with the Church, considering and helping forward every department of the life and work of the parish. The Council must not become narrow and parochial, but be in name and character truly Catholic. Its watchwords must be, "I believe in

Jesus Christ our Lord" and "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." It must be a body with a heart like unto that of the Lord of the Church caring for the needs of the whole world. It must consider every method for helping on the work of God. May I briefly indicate some of the problems with which I trust it will deal :—

(I) First, in the parish itself.

(*a*) *With regard to the Clergy.*—The Council must consider the stipends received by the incumbent and his assistants. It will be their responsibility to see that these are adequate. In many parishes Church people simply live largely on the benefactions of their ancestors. Is it, therefore, too much to expect them to supplement at any rate that income derived from the pious gifts of Church people in days gone by? But in some parishes—if not in all—the Church Council may well consider whether it could not transfer either altogether or in part the burden of dilapidations on the rectory or vicarage from the incumbent to themselves. The Wesleyan Church does so for her ministers, and Church people ought to follow their excellent example. Also, although not legally liable to do so, I think that the parish and not the incumbent should pay for the insurance of the rectory house. The incumbent is not its owner, but simply its occupier, and in the event of its destruction the cost of its re-erection would fall largely upon the parishioners. This is only a detail, but it illustrates the principle of the responsibility of the parish for the full maintenance of its ministry.

(*b*) *With regard to the Parish.*—The Parochial Church Council may, with advantage, consider such subjects as the care and maintenance of the fabric of the church, the adequate payment of the verger and all in the employ of the Church, the arrangements by which the social side of the Church's life is increased and its members brought more into living touch with each other. But beyond all this, the Council should take a real and active share in promoting the spiritual life of the Church. As a rule the officials of a church know little concerning the work going on in connexion with it—such as work among the young in the Sunday School, the Church Lads' Brigade, the Cadets or the Scouts. Yet these organizations and all others, whether for men, women, or children, are the concern of the *whole* Church and not merely of a few devoted workers. It may be possible for representatives of all these bodies to be upon the Council, but in any event, every organization in the parish should have its work considered by the Council periodically, and so far as is possible its needs supplied and be made to feel that the whole Church is behind it. Such work as is done in the open air, or in visitation of the sick, the aged, the careless and the indifferent, ought to receive the practical sympathy of the Council and, in a large town parish, a sub-committee should be appointed to watch over various matters, such as the purity of the entertainments in public halls or cinemas, the condition of the streets at night, the proper control of public houses. In fact, the Parochial Church

Council should take the broadest view of its responsibilities and duties and become gradually the council of war for the Church militant in the parish.

(II) *With regard to the larger life of the Church outside.*—The Council must make itself acquainted with the work of the Church in the Diocese, in the nation and throughout the world. Occasionally some one thoroughly competent should be asked to come and speak quite informally on some aspect of Diocesan work—such as the Crusade, Board of Finance, London-over-the-Border Fund, Foreign Missions, Temperance, or Rescue Work.

The Church Council must not become a mere piece of mechanism, but something imbued with life. This is the ideal. Make it your own. Do not be discouraged by one, two or three failures. If you succeed, then, indeed, there will be real grounds for hope of revival in your midst.

When the National Church Assembly meets, it will have many proposals before it in addition to those relating to Parochial Church Councils. The Reform of Convocation is urgently demanded and must be taken in hand. The Lower House is an anomaly. The official element is too large and the representative element unfair. For every Diocese, however small, to have as large a representation as the whole of the Diocese of London is a point in question. Again, it will be asked to formulate a Bill dealing with the revision of the Prayer Book. Personally, I regret that the revision has not been made more drastic and far more practical than it has

been, but still, many useful reforms have been introduced, although some of the proposed changes are causing considerable anxiety to many loyal Churchmen. Proposals relating to what is commonly called "The Parson's Freehold" are certain to be made. Personally I am strongly in favour of its abolition, but, if any alteration is made, it must be combined with—

(1) Provision that the incumbent is not placed at the mercy of a tyrannical squire in the country or of an impossible Council in the town. Some outside tribunal must determine his removal if it is decided upon.

(2) The Church must make herself responsible for every man she ordains, so long as his character is good. She must find him work, an adequate stipend while at work and a sufficient pension when he ceases to work.

(3) The recognition that no age limit can be fixed. In Church work experience and character count for much. For instance, the retirement of the Archbishop of Canterbury, at the present time, would be nothing short of a calamity. Yet if no age limit is fixed, there must be a system by which a man is removable at any age if he is incompetent. The welfare of the parish must receive the first consideration of the Church, although at the same time she must make due provision for her clergy.

I now turn to the position of churchwardens and their duties, which remain exactly as before the Enabling Bill was passed. Wardens are required

by the Canons to present to the Ordinary, at his Visitation, whatever is wrong or irregular, whether in the parson or the parishioners, and they may be compelled to do so by the Bishop. As to the parson, if he is irregular in the performance of divine worship, or alters it, or omits any part of it, or adds anything not authorized by the rubric, or if there be not at least one sermon on the Sunday, or if he neglects to visit the sick or to administer the Sacraments, they must notify the same. You will see, therefore, that I was bound to put the questions I did. If anything I have erred on the side of leniency rather than of stringency. Generally the returns of the wardens speak of conscientious and self-denying work on the part of the clergy, although in some cases there is much to be desired. On the whole, the complaints are few and mostly concern points of minor importance. But if a minister fails to do his duty, or his conduct is such as to bring scandal upon the Church, it is the duty of the wardens either jointly or severally to report the matter at once to the Bishop. Wardens have no right to allow alterations within a church, or ornaments, including statues, to be introduced without a Faculty. Frequently frivolous excuses for not carrying out this plain duty are made, such as that a Faculty only means extra expense, or that it serves no useful purpose, or that there is no opposition to what is proposed. These statements do not bear upon the matter. The law and rule of the Church is clear and emphatic and it must be obeyed. The

present incumbent, the present wardens, and the present congregation hold the church in trust for future generations, and one of the conditions of the trust is that a Faculty from a source outside themselves and representing the whole body must be obtained before any alteration is made. If any warden is in difficulty on any such point he should at once seek the guidance of the Archdeacon. The wardens are also responsible for the due and adequate insurance of the Parish Church. They should consider whether a revision of the sum assured is not required owing to the rapid increase in the cost of materials and of labour. It would be difficult to replace any church at a less cost than roughly between £30 and £50 per sitting, but the insurance on many churches is on a very much lower basis. I warmly commend the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office as the one which ought to receive the support of the Church authorities. Its profits are distributed for Church purposes, such as clergy pensions.

During a vacancy the wardens should obtain the sequestration of the living, whereby they are enabled to obtain a priest-in-charge at the rate of two hundred pounds per annum, but they must remember that any priest officiating then, or at any time, must hold the permission of the Bishop. The nominated incumbent cannot be permitted to officiate until after his institution.

One of the most important duties of the wardens is to see that all parishioners duly resort to their

churches upon all Sundays and Holy Days, and to admonish those who, having no great or urgent cause of absence, are found slack and negligent in resorting to the church, and, if necessary, presenting such to the Bishop. I realize that it is impossible to carry out this direction in the manner in which those who drew it up intended, owing to the different conditions which now prevail. But the underlying principle of the direction still remains and must govern the life and indicate the line of action of every warden. It implies :—

(1) That the wardens do not fulfil their duties when they act merely as the treasurers to the church. They are to be the leaders of the laity in every Evangelistic effort for reaching the people. This is the modern way by which they can "see that all parishioners duly resort to their churches." The wardens ought to be the driving force of all Evangelistic and spiritual efforts in the parish.

(2) The wardens themselves should be keen to attend the services on Sunday and on Holy Days, otherwise how can they fulfil their duty concerning the attendance of others? Personally, I do not see how any man can conscientiously fulfil the duties pertaining to a warden unless he is a communicant and keen concerning the Kingdom of God. The whole Church is indebted to the splendid body of Church people who render such excellent service to the Church as wardens. In my opinion they are more in the succession to the first seven Deacons than those who bear that name in modern

days, and as such should be men of good report and full of the Holy Ghost.

May I now lay before you some considerations concerning the government of the Church. Throughout the world there is a lack of discipline and a lack of the recognition of authority. It is seen abroad and it is seen at home. This is a grave danger, and unless this tendency is counteracted, and discipline is restored and authority is respected, there will be grave trouble in the future. At this time the Church should be the wholesome example to the nation in this respect; but is she? It cannot be denied that in some directions anarchy prevails. The Royal Commission on Ritual fourteen years ago urged the reform of ecclesiastical courts owing to the lack of discipline then, but to-day the question is even more urgent and imperative. It is not my intention to trace at all fully the process by which we have arrived at the present condition, but various causes have contributed to it.

(1) *Our connexion with the State.*—I am strongly in favour of that connexion being maintained. If the gains and losses of the union are weighed I think the balance is strongly in favour of the union being continued; and yet there are disadvantages, one being that the Church is hindered in maintaining discipline by the difficulty of adjusting her courts to fit in with her position as a National Church, and this has tended to produce her present chaotic position.

(2) *The birth and growth of the Tractarian*

Movement.—All history shows that the birth of any great movement, whether it be of a political, ecclesiastical or social nature, causes unsettlement. Some of its adherents leave the main body and run into the by-ways of excess. The leaders of thought at the time of its birth do not always gauge the real inward meaning of the movement, nor its possibilities, nor the lines along which it is likely to develop, and, consequently, they handle it wrongly and unnecessary friction follows. This was the case in the early days of the Oxford movement. It was not always clearly understood either by its friends or by its enemies. We realize now the grave mistakes which were made in those early days. It would have been strange had it not been so, for its adherents were dealt with by thirty or forty Bishops, holding various views, doctrinally and ecclesiastically, and each dealing with the movement in his own way. Chaos was almost inevitable. Even when collective action was taken we see, as we look back, how mistaken it often was, although done with the sincere desire to deal with the situation adequately, wisely and firmly. An instance of this kind was the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874, and which is now practically dead and ineffective. Thus we have arrived at our present position. I do not desire to enter into controversy or to express any opinion upon the recent cases in the Dioceses of Manchester, Truro, or Taunton, but no one can reflect upon those cases without realizing two things :—

(*a*) That for some reason or other, rightly or wrongly, large bodies of Church people regard the various Courts before which they were brought as unsuitable and objectionable.

(*b*) That some clergy appear more concerned about the character of the courts than about the uncanonical action of the priest, as at Taunton.

Thus the situation is critical and grave. There are three classes within the Church who hold diametrically opposite views concerning ecclesiastical courts.

(*a*) A wild and impossible class who are not Anglican and not Catholic and who repudiate every change made at the Reformation. They throw over all restraint and simply appeal to some outside authority, supposed or real, in support of what they do. They are a foe to order and discipline and are a danger to the Church.

(*b*) A class who are convinced that, on the whole, the best courts are likely to be those already in existence, subject to alteration on certain points.

(*c*) A third class of Church people, thoroughly loyal and spiritual, who hold conscientiously that all spiritual matters connected with the Church should be settled and determined by purely spiritual courts.

How are these various opinions to be met? It is not for me to determine. Recently I raised this question in the Upper House of Convocation and moved a resolution, which was carried unanimously, affirming its urgency and calling upon the National

Church Assembly to deal with it at the earliest moment.

I have been carefully considering the advisability of calling a Synod, and I may come to the conclusion that to do so may be of advantage to the work and life of the Church in the Diocese. At the time of the Reformation, Cranmer strongly supported its continuance. It has historical precedent behind it, and is a spiritual body to which all the clergy of the Diocese, beneficed and unbeneficed, would be summoned. The two points on which there must be grave consideration before I take the step I have indicated concern—

(*a*) *The Position of the Laity.*—I hold very strongly that the laity must have some mode of expressing their opinions on the great questions which affect the Church of which they are members. They cannot be ignored, nor can the worship, discipline and work of the Church in the Diocese be dealt with without their being consulted and their advice taken. How their opinions can be expressed outside the Synod it is not easy to determine, and yet it is clear that their opinion must be obtained in some way unless we are to depart seriously from early and Catholic procedure.

(*b*) *The Functions and Powers of the Synod.*—Their procedure at different periods of the Church has varied, and a clear understanding of the authority and function of the Synod must be reached before I can permit its being summoned. One point, however, I think is clear, that the Synod is

not a judicial body, and the question arises as to how a priest is to be dealt with who refuses to carry out the decision of his Bishop promulgated in, and with the concurrence, of his Synod. Is a resort to be made to the civil courts for his removal from his benefice or is he to be left in undisputed possession ?

These two points are of real importance, and must receive careful consideration before a Synod is summoned. I hope that a final decision upon this important matter may be reached at an early date.

I have dealt at some length with this important question. We must secure discipline. Since I became your Bishop I have striven to administer it fairly and impartially. I have my own personal convictions, and they tend to become stronger year by year ; but I came among you not as a Party Bishop, but as a Bishop of the Catholic Church, glad to recognize that within its fold there was room for men to hold other views and to express themselves differently regarding worship and the faith, and yet to be loyal to our common Lord and His Church. It is in this spirit that I have striven to administer this great Diocese. No one is infallible, and certainly he who addresses you is not, but if mistakes have been made they have been not of set purpose or owing to party bias. I appeal to clergy and laity alike to realize the importance of discipline and the recognition of authority, and for this reason to subordinate their own desires

and wishes. But after all, "not by might, not by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord." Bishops—priests—laity, each and all, can only act in the Church of Christ in His Spirit and according to His will. Therefore we have need to pray and that constantly, "O God, forasmuch as without Thee, we are not able to please Thee: mercifully grant that Thy Holy Spirit may in all things direct and rule our hearts: through Jesus Christ our Lord." Let every heart join in saying Amen, Amen, Amen.

CHAPTER III

THE CHURCH AND HER SERVICES

I DESIRE to draw your attention to the services held within the churches consecrated for public worship. It is surely apparent to all of us that there must be some authority which can and does determine what services may or may not be held. No loyal priest need be reminded where that authority rests. It rests with the Church whose minister he is. She has made her directions clearly and definitely. Before proceeding to ordain a man to the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, she demands that the candidate shall make a serious declaration and subscribe to a solemn oath.

But that the priest may realize more fully their importance he is asked to repeat them on any change of sphere of work, and before he is instituted to any benefice. The Book of Service for his and his people's use comes to him with the words upon the title page, "Rites and Ceremonies of *the Church* according to the use of the Church of England," and thus is marked the binding connexion between "the Church," that is, the whole Catholic Church, and the Church of England.

In doing so the Church of England is following, clearly and definitely, primitive practice. When Constantine divided his kingdom into fourteen Dioceses or districts, which, as Gibbon says, "equalled the just measure of a powerful kingdom," the Church, conforming herself to the civil constitution, established fourteen Diocesan churches, one for every civil Diocese. These were autonomous, united by love and faith, but altogether independent respecting authority. Men who appeal to the decisions of Œcumenical Councils frequently overlook the fact that no fewer than eleven canons of the four Œcumenical Councils were passed to guarantee the independence of the several Diocesan churches. Therefore it is a mediæval, not a primitive practice, to ignore the authority of national churches. Maintaining this fact, Archbishop Laud said truly, "to reform what is amiss in doctrine and manners is as lawful for a particular church as it is to publish and promulgate anything that is Catholic," and as the Bishop of Winchester rightly says :—

"It is the very essence of our position as Anglican Churchmen that we have accepted the Church of England as for us representative of the Church Catholic."

A writer in the *Church Times* asked recently, "Who gave a part of the Church, that is, the Church of England, the right to reform or construct?" The answer is, "The practice of the Catholic Church until Rome, a part of that Church, assumed the

right of the whole body and sought the domination of the Christian world." Every priest is asked at his ordination whether he will give "faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine of Christ . . . as this Church and Realm hath received the same," and to this each man assents in the words "I will do so." Surely nothing could be clearer than that a priest is bound to interpret Catholic practice and teaching not as he pleases, but as the Church of England in her corporate capacity has accepted and interpreted it. Yet at a recent gathering of priests at Hoxton it was stated :—

"We cannot use the Prayer Book even for our private office without breaking our promise to give canonical obedience, nor can any gentleman ever mention the Book to us again."

How different was the language of Pusey and Keble and the leaders of the Tractarian movement. However men may differ as to the accuracy of their interpretation of the Church's position, these men were all great Church of England men, inasmuch as they claimed that what they taught and practised was to be found in the Prayer Book or in agreement with it. They would have repudiated with indignation any suggestion that they taught or advocated the introduction into our churches of any service, however beautiful, however devotional it might be, from a foreign source, if it were not found within our Prayer Book or authorized by our Bishops. The strength of the movement lay largely in a firm assertion of the *Ecclesia*

Anglicana as such. Its supporters found this inspiration in their work by clear and distinct allegiance to the Prayer Book. I think this fact is largely overlooked by many to-day, and therefore I think it well to recall some statements which plainly indicate their mind and what their teaching was.

Thus wrote Pusey in a petition to Convocation :—

"That amid the contradictory teaching of individual clergy, it has been solace to thousands to be able to point out that the Church of England does teach clear definite truth through her Prayer Book in the language of the people, which Prayer Book we all, Bishops and clergy, own to be superior to and above ourselves."

Again, in writing concerning individualistic action even in his day, he says :—

"I suppose that in no Church or body would the claim be allowed that an individual priest should of his own mind change the existing ritual without ascertaining the mind of his congregation, without the sanction of the Bishop or the concurrence of his co-presbyters."

Both Pusey and Keble, while maintaining the right at all times to use and assert everything which they believed to be allowable by the Book of Common Prayer, recognized in every way the authority of the Bishops. This is seen throughout their whole life. May I mention a few instances? Take the case in connexion with *Tract* 90 and various statements found in the lives of Newman and Pusey bearing upon it :—

Newman: "I wrote to the Archdeacon saying that a Bishop's lightest word *ex cathedra* was heavy, and that judgment on a book was a rare occurrence. Therefore under the circumstances I must stop the *Tracts* and recall those which were in circulation. If the Bishop would be kind enough to tell him privately what *Tracts* he objected to, I would withdraw them without a word."

To Newman it was a necessity that his Bishop should approve and support him.

To quote him again :—

"My good fellows, *you* make me the head of a *party*—that is your external view; but I know what I am—I am a clergyman under the Bishop of Oxford and anything more is accidental."

Pusey, commenting upon this, said :—

"The sudden and immediate stoppage of a publication so known as the *Tracts* is in itself a very decisive measure: Mr. Newman most cheerfully concurs in it."

Keble's language was exactly in the same strain :—

"There is a deep doctrinal difference that cannot be got over, but the great thing is obeying one's superiors when one really knows their wishes."

Such-like statements are almost innumerable. The early Tractarians had a clear policy which might be, and probably was, wrongly interpreted by themselves at times, but they maintained as the basis of their attitude loyalty to the Prayer Book and the authority of their Bishop.

But it may be asked upon what authority the

Prayer Book rests? I am speaking to you as your Father-in-God and not as an official of the State. Let it be remembered that although I may have been nominated by a Prime Minister, all my authority which I hold and maintain in the Church of God I derive from my consecration and not from the State. It is therefore as one invested by the Church that I am now addressing you. It is true that Parliament ordered the Prayer Book to be used in churches, but it was already the Bishops' book which they ordered, and when I ordain any man or give him my licence to officiate or admit him to the cure of souls I impose on him the obligation to use the Book of Common Prayer. I demand his promise to do so. If he did not promise I should not ordain him. I demand his use of the Prayer Book not out of loyalty to the Prayer Book, but from loyalty to me, his Bishop, and the promise he made me.

He owes it to himself, to his conscience, and to the sacredness of the ministry that he should scrupulously keep it. It follows that the only one who can allow any deviations from the Prayer Book is myself, for I, in the name of the Church, imposed the book upon him, and it was to me that the promise was made. This surely is in accordance with Catholic tradition.

The *Tablet* (the Roman Catholic organ), writing on this subject, says :—

"If there be any point on which a Bishop has the right to use authority it is surely that of the

public services in a Parish Church. If the Ordinary has no jurisdiction in such a matter as this, what authority of any kind can he be supposed to have?"

But even the Bishop cannot alter or allow as he thinks fit. He is bound by his consecration declarations and oaths, and can only act in accordance with their spirit and purpose.

That the claim I am making is one which I am justified to make is clear. May I mention in support of this contention two paragraphs from men whose authority on questions of this kind many will admit.

Newbolt and Darwell Stone: In an appendix of their work on the Church of England, there is a remarkable statement drawn up in 1898 and signed by practically all the leading High Churchmen of that day, including such men as Canon Body, F. E. Brightman, R. Rhodes Bristow, V. S. S. Coles, Charles Gore, Henry Scott-Holland, T. A. Lacey, Canon Newbolt, and F. W. Puller.

This is what they say:—

"... We desire to say that we hold that by the acceptance of the terms of this declaration:

"1. We pledge ourselves to the use of the rites and ceremonies prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer as opposed to the omission of them.

"2. We pledge ourselves to the use of them as the positive and sufficient rule and order of the ministrations of the Church for which they are provided, as opposed to modifications of them, whether by change, addition, or omission, except

in so far as such modifications may be enjoined or allowed by lawful authority."

A similar position has also been adopted by the English Church Union, as stated by Lord Phillimore in his letter to the *Church Times* on August 8, 1918. He says :—

"The point really at issue (at St. Michael's, Shoreditch) was a simple one, namely, whether a parish priest may continue to use public services in his church other than those authorized, without the sanction of the Bishop. To that, in the opinion of the President and Council, there can be but one answer—he cannot do so. This opinion rests not on the Act of Uniformity, but on fundamental principles of the Catholic Church."

The conclusion of the whole matter is that a parish priest must confine himself to the services within the Prayer Book unless he obtains the sanction of the Bishop for any other service which he may wish to hold, and it is the Bishop's duty to see that this rule of the Church is observed, hence my questions which you have been kind enough to answer. They were searching and wide in their character, and they dealt equally with omissions from the services enjoined, as well as with additions to them. I have reminded you of the declaration of assent. But I would further remind you that it is by no means a merely negative declaration. It is on the other hand positive, and involves a definite promise : "I will use the form in the book prescribed." Is that true of all

of us? Do we use it as it is ordered to be used? I am not now referring to petty details. No one can deny that after some two hundred and fifty years it is impossible to carry out in every minute detail each and all of the directions contained in the Book of Common Prayer. But there are certain duties enjoined and instructions given which must be fulfilled and carried out.

The overwhelming majority of clergy in the Diocese are loyal in spirit and practice to the declarations, but I regret that from the returns I have received, some clergy are not rendering to the Church or to their parish that which the Prayer Book directs.

Before I mention some of the most important omissions, may I say that it is nothing less than a scandal and a disgrace that any church should be kept closed day by day. I know the difficulties which are alleged, but far better run risks and let the House of God be open than, by avoiding the risks, make the church a useless building except on Sundays.

I would now direct your attention to several rubrics which in some churches are not observed. In doing so it may be of interest to notice that this is not a new complaint as far as Essex is concerned. I find that in 1763 only in 102 out of 310 churches in Essex were there two services of any kind on Sunday, and in some only one service fortnightly, while others had one service per month. Only twenty parishes held a monthly Communion,

and five parishes only held any weekday services. This was largely altered by the Evangelical Revival and was still further affected by the Tractarian movement.

(1) *Daily Service.*—I regret to find that in no less than 171 churches there is no daily service, while 138 only have the daily offices occasionally. Is this right or satisfactory? What says the rubric?

"And all priests and deacons are to say daily the Morning and Evening Prayer either privately or openly, *not being let by sickness, or some other cause.*"

". . . And the curate . . . being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably hindered, . . . shall cause a bell to be tolled thereunto a convenient time before he begin that the people may come to hear God's Word, and to pray with him."

Now I think it is clear that the rubric intends that the daily office shall be said in church. It is often forgotten that the very title of Morning Prayer implies this: "The Order for Morning or Evening Prayer daily throughout the year." When only can we be released from the duty? "When we are otherwise reasonably hindered." Can any priest say honestly that he is reasonably hindered three hundred and thirteen mornings and evenings every year? It is objected, "No one will come." Has a real effort been made to induce any of the parishioners to attend? But cannot the parish priest be as Moses on the mountain top praying

for Joshua in the field, at the plough, in the factory and in the Stock Exchange? The late Bishop Sheepshanks tells of a shepherd in Norfolk who said, "When I am out in the fields of a morning and hear the bell rung, I take off my cap and say, 'God bless the parson and God bless the people.'" The obligation for daily services is a very real one, and I bring it to your notice.

(2) *The Litany is to be said on Sundays, Wednesdays and Fridays.* This is in several churches omitted without any excuse. Every parish priest is himself the weaker by the omission. Again, in many churches the rubric is entirely overlooked which directs that "the curate shall declare unto the people what Holy days and Fasting days are in the week following to be observed." Whatever view may be taken as to the mode of fasting, no one can deny that the Church directs that on certain days her members are to fast, and if this fact had been clearly taught and emphasized in days gone by, the members of the Church would have been living to-day more simple and less luxurious lives than they are.

Convocation has recently suggested an amendment concerning the recitation of the Athanasian Creed, but until this alteration has been finally adopted I must ask that clergy continue to use this ancient and valuable statement of our faith. Personally, I have found this form of the creed of great use in helping men to understand in outline the great doctrine of the Trinity.

(3) *Holy Days.*—I regret to find that in 134 churches in the Diocese there is no adequate observance of Saints' Days. There can be no sufficient excuse for this omission. The direction is clear and explicit. What are known as Red Letter Days are to be observed. At the rubric at the end of the Communion Office we find the words "upon the Sundays and other Holy days there shall be said." Again the directions after the Nicene Creed that notice must be given of Holy days, and the provision of a special collect, epistle, and gospel for such days points to the fact that the Church expects such days to be observed by the clergy and laity alike. A point frequently overlooked is, that the rubrics nearly always combine Sundays and Holy days, and in my opinion a priest has as little right, from a Church point of view, to omit the observance of one as of the other. I am thankful that generally Ash Wednesday and Ascension Day are observed, but here again in a very few churches these days so full of meaning are unobserved. I view this omission most seriously, and formally I direct that in every church throughout the Diocese these two great days must be observed as the Church directs. Is there a parish in the land where the incumbent could not secure two or three persons at least to communicate with him on a Saint's Day?

On one point I have been asked to state my ruling, and that is as to the rubric requiring a certain number to communicate with the priest. I strongly

deprecate what may be called "solitary Masses." The priest has no right to celebrate by himself or with only a server assisting. Convocation has lately amended the rubric so that the number required is reduced to two, and I hope that no priest will habitually celebrate with less than that number. Yet I feel that if, on a wet and foggy morning for instance, the priest finds that one man or one woman has braved the weather and has come longing to draw nigh and take the Holy Sacrament to his or her comfort, the priest should not turn the hungry soul away unfed. Loyalty united with common sense is a valuable asset when found in a parish priest. But it must be understood that this applies to weekday celebrations and exceptional circumstances and must not be taken as approving or sanctioning what are known as Sung Eucharists on Sundays with habitually no communicants. In one church the celebrant said he would be shocked if any one presented himself for Communion. In saying so he denied his Lord, Who instituted the Feast, and proved himself disloyal to the Church, whose plain direction is certainly that there should be no celebration without communicants.

(4) *Holy Communion on Sunday.*—To my great surprise and deep regret, I find that in eighty-three churches there is no weekly celebration, and in thirteen others only one per month, and in one church only eight celebrations in a year. I cannot allow this to pass without a vigorous protest and

a plain and clear direction that in every church throughout the Diocese an effort should be made to secure a celebration every Sunday. It is the duty of the priest to make the offer. He is directed to "exhort his parishioners to the often receiving of the Holy Communion when it shall be publicly administered in the church," but if he appears to set a low ideal of its value by the few opportunities he gives, how can he expect his people to realize its importance? At the least the Communion should be administered every Sunday, as undoubtedly it was in the primitive Church.

(5) I deplore the tendency in some parishes to relegate Morning Prayer into a position which is unseemly and almost bordering on irreverence. To have it said, merely because it is ordered, and in practically an empty church, and to rush it through in a quarter of an hour, is something which was never contemplated and something which I strongly condemn. To hold up the Communion Service and contrast it with Morning Prayer to the disparagement of the latter, is as unwise as it is disloyal. No one values the Holy Communion more than I do, and yet I confess that I feel that the Church stands likely to lose in the end by the position given to Morning Prayer in many churches. Do let it be remembered that the Sung Eucharist so-called is not the principal service. If there is a principal service it surely is that at which the largest number "take" and "eat" and "drink," and thus obey their Lord's command, rather than

that at which there may be more music and ceremonial, but less obedience to the Divine command. The value of Morning Prayer cannot be gainsaid, and that the spiritual life of believers loses by its practical suppression is equally true. The abandonment of Morning Prayer means that large numbers of Church-people never hear half the Psalms, the *Te Deum*, the *Benedictus*, the *Jubilate*, the Litany, and lessons from the Old and New Testament. I am thankful that in many parishes Morning Prayer and Sermon have been retained at the usual hour, while, for instance, as at the Cathedral, a Choral Communion is held at nine-thirty. I think this is a wiser arrangement than the former, and I commend it to those clergy whom this subject concerns.

(6) *Concerning the Holy Communion itself.*— I think that having regard to the nature of this service, concerning which all along the centuries have waged controversies of the most bitter type, waxing at times so violent that blood has been shed, that every parish priest must be *sensitively scrupulous* concerning the way in which the Holy Communion is administered in his church. He must neither omit, alter, nor add without the authority of his Ordinary. I believe the service as ordered in the Prayer Book to be generally followed, but to some matters I must draw your attention.

(*a*) In some churches the recitation of the Ten Commandments is omitted. This I cannot allow,

but I should permit the summary of them as given by our Lord to be substituted if used as directed by the Convocation revision. In two or three churches the Ante-Communion is occasionally entirely omitted. This course I prohibit, for it is contrary to the spirit as well as to the letter of the service. On certain days the *Gloria* is not said or sung. No priest has any right to make this change. The Church in her corporate capacity is wiser than he is, and has directed its use every time the service is used.

(*b*) The alteration of the Canon. It is not my intention to enter upon the controversy which has waged and is now waging in this matter. I have expressed in Convocation my desire to meet the wishes of those who advocate some change, so far as such a change is in accord with scriptural truth and sound doctrine. But I feel strongly that in the very heart of such a service so wonderful and so great, that no priest ought for a moment to forswear himself and forget and abandon his solemn promise to use the form prescribed. Bishop Gore emphasizes this point. He says:—"It is quite one thing for a priest to insist on obeying the Book and it is quite another thing to claim to disobey the order which we have pledged ourselves to follow. To violate a solemn undertaking constantly renewed is to subscribe to the 'scrap of paper' doctrine which we have fought Germany in order to repudiate."

I put here three questions.

1. Would any priest of the Roman or the Orthodox Church be allowed to substitute our form of the Communion Office for his own because he thought ours to be superior to his, and more in accord with Catholic tradition?

2. If a priest is allowed to alter the central portion of the Communion Office, is there any limit to his power to alter or amend any and every part of the Prayer Book?

3. Can any Church allow her priests to alter at their own pleasure the Communion Office which she has directed them to use?

I ask any priest to study solemnly these questions and give his answers as in the presence of his Lord as he did upon the day of his ordination. It is open to and allowable for any priest to endeavour to get any service altered by lawful authority, but absolutely indefensible for any man to take the law into his own hands and alter according to his own ideas the service which is ordered by the Church, of which, after all, he is only the servant or minister. I recognize that in one or two instances deviations may be made, such as those which have received more or less general assent. Among these I place the reading of the "Longer Exhortations," although I could wish that they might be read on the Sundays previous to the great Festivals, even if they take the place of the sermon on those days. Further, when the number of communicants is large and a priest has no assistance in administering, I think that the words of Administration

recommended by Convocation may be used, if used loyally as there laid down.

Two other matters should be named as requiring attention. It is the custom in some churches for the Bread and Wine to be placed upon the Holy Table before the commencement of the service of Holy Communion. This is contrary to the rubric, and I trust that by means of a Credence Table or by some such arrangement the directions of the rubric may be duly carried out. The other is a question of more importance. I refer to the use of the mixed chalice. The Lincoln judgment ruled that the chalice should be prepared before the service begins. In this the judgment followed ancient precedent. Liturgical precedent is in favour of the mixing before the service. It was the custom at Westminster before the Reformation; it was the custom all over England for Low Mass; it is still practised by the Dominicans and in the Mez arabic rite. It is as old as the Celtic Stow Missal and throughout the Orthodox Eastern Church the Elements are prepared before the service begins and are brought in during the Litany. I hope, therefore, that every priest who desires the mixed chalice will follow the ancient custom and carry out my directions.

Before asking your attention to matters of greater importance, may I earnestly press for simplicity in all our services and the avoidance of all unnecessary and at times almost meaningless ritual. I am frankly concerned at the absence of

quiet and rest within the sanctuary and the growth of movement and activity. There is so little quiet. Servers move here and there, do this and that, and I wonder what becomes of their own quiet devotions. They are mostly young Christians, and instead of being encouraged to "move" they should be exhorted to be "still."

May I give an instance of what I mean by referring to the *Sanctus* bell. I am aware that by the tolling of the great bell outside, the faithful who are sick are enabled to realize at what point the service is, although it is a question whether any benefit they may gain is not more than counterbalanced by the disturbance to the worshippers inside. But I am now referring to the use of the *Sanctus* bell within the sanctuary. May I suggest four reasons why this practice, if in use, may well be discontinued?

(*a*) In olden times when the service was in Latin and when scarcely any one could read, it is easy to understand that such a bell was thought to be necessary, but to-day when the service is in English, read in an audible voice, and when practically every one can read, can any one say that the necessity for such a bell exists?

(*b*) All those present are supposed to be eligible to communicate according to ancient practice and the whole trend of the service leading up to the exhortation to "draw near." Now do such people, prepared for Confirmation, instructed in the service, need any such reminder as to what is being done?

(*c*) Does it not almost border on irreverence, however unintentional, to ring a bell in the midst of a solemn—a most solemn—prayer to Almighty God?

(*d*) It was also not even named among the Ornaments in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. For these and other reasons I do appeal to clergy not to introduce such unnecessary practices, and if they have adopted them, to reconsider the question whether quietness and stillness is not often of greater advantage than to do something unauthorized and unnecessary and calculated to disturb spiritual men in their worship and devotions at a time when quietness and solemnity are so advisable.

I have now to call your attention to services which are not provided by the Prayer Book. Is there any priest here who would maintain that either he or any other priest has the right to observe *any* days he wishes and hold any service which he pleases without reference to his Bishop? Surely such a position is untenable anywhere within the Catholic Church. Convocation has appointed Collects, Epistles and Gospels for All Souls' Day, the name of Jesus and the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin, although as yet these days have not been approved by Parliament. Beyond these days no priest has the slightest authority to observe any other without the consent of his Bishop, nor has he the right to observe any day appointed to be used, as he thinks best. As many of you know, I have striven to meet the legitimate desires of

clergy and laity alike, but in return I ask for their full loyalty. Before using any service other than those contained in the Prayer Book, my consent should be obtained.

THE SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM.—There is no service of the Church more important than that in which a person, whether child or adult, is officially admitted into its membership, and there are few services which present greater difficulties to the parish priest. With regard to the baptism of adults, the greatest care must be exercised in their preparation. It must not be hurried and it must be thorough. Notification must be made to the Bishop according to the plain direction of the rubric and in time for him to correspond with the candidate previous to the baptism. I regard the adult form of baptismal service as suitable for unbaptized candidates for Confirmation. Normally adults should be baptized in the public service of the Church at the time specified, or, remembering modern conditions, at a special service held in the weeknight to which all communicants should be specially invited and *urged* to attend. In the Mission field the baptism of adults is a service of the greatest importance, and every effort must be made at home to cause every communicant to realize the greatness of the service and of their responsibility with regard to it. It is equally important that clear and definite teaching should be given on the whole question of baptism. Very few Church people have really grasped its full

doctrinal import, and even to them it frequently meant little more than the naming of the child.

In country parishes where the number of baptisms is few, I think the time appointed in the Prayer Book for the service should be strictly followed, but the situation in a large town parish is very different. In such parishes every Sunday, probably a dozen children or even more are presented for baptism, and it becomes almost impossible for the service to be held every Sunday in Morning or Evening Prayer. To attempt to do so would cause the very people we are anxious to reach to cease to attend. Yet the congregation in some of our great parishes ought to have brought to their remembrance the importance of this Sacrament by having it administered in their midst on certain occasions even if only one or two children are then baptised. By doing so a great principle would be preserved. The time and method of the service presents difficulty, and how to conduct the service. I cannot encourage the plan by which Sunday by Sunday, Holy Baptism is administered at a children's service. Apart from all other considerations the Office for the Public Baptism of Infants is not an Office for children. Its language and construction is beyond their comprehension. Children may occasionally be invited to a baptism, but habitual attendance is likely to weary a growing boy or girl and in many cases to repel them from what becomes tedious Church attendance. This often occurs when a child reaches a certain age. The

following suggestions may be worthy of consideration :—

(1) Occasionally the Office should be taken at full Evening Prayer, no matter how large the parish.

(2) The Office should not be taken habitually at a children's service.

(3) That arrangements should be made so that at every administration of baptism some representatives of the Church should be present, and these should be drawn from as many different branches of Church life as possible. This avoids on the one hand the same people being present frequently and at the same time brings the largest possible number of communicants into contact with the other great Sacrament of the Church. In all great parishes there are numbers of guilds and clubs, and of these a rota for attendance might be formed supplemented by other communicants. This would require organization, but it would present the Sacrament to the minds of Communicants as something for which they, in their corporate capacity, were responsible.

(4) In working-class districts it will be found difficult to ensure any adequate preparation before baptism owing to the health of the mother and other reasons, but one visit at least (more if possible), should be paid to the home after Baptism. In the country districts this should be an absolute rule, and the priest should pray in the home with both father and mother for the child. The visit

should be paid when the father is at home. In a large parish a special Guild of Visitors should be formed of motherly women, all communicants, to visit the mothers of children baptized.

(5) A card containing the names of sponsors, etc., should be supplied. The Upper House of Convocation has passed a resolution allowing parents to act as sponsors provided one other person acts in that capacity.

(6) The service itself should never be rushed, but conducted as reverently as possible. The priest would find it helpful if he invariably gave a brief address as to the meaning of the service before its commencement.

If these suggestions are carried into effect I think that many of the difficulties which exist will be removed.

CONFIRMATION.—I have asked that no candidate should be presented for Confirmation under the age of twelve years. This is a lower age than that fixed in the majority of Dioceses, and, personally, I prefer candidates at a much later age. Theoretically, much might be advanced in favour of an earlier age, but my experience in Bethnal Green convinced me that a later age proves, in the end, better for the lad or girl. This statement is borne out by an article written by the present Bishop of Southwark when Vicar of Portsea, in *The Work of a Great Parish* (pages 166 to 169). He states: "All our experience at Portsea is in favour of sixteen or seventeen as the right age." "It is freely admitted,"

says Canon Garbett, "that a younger age is encouraged by the custom of the Catholic Church, and that it is perfectly legal within the Church of England: that it has the advantage of obtaining the candidates from those who are still in the Sunday School before they have had much chance of drifting away, but on the other side it can be urged that no proof has been advanced that the younger confirmee lapses less than those older." This testimony is corroborated by numbers of incumbents of some of the largest and best-worked parishes in England. Although the qualification for Confirmation can never be one *merely* of understanding, yet one great difference between the Church of Rome and ourselves is that our Church insists on "understanding." Our services must be in a language "understood by the people," whereas the Roman services are in Latin. So on the question of Confirmation, the Council of Trent asserted: "If any one shall say that those baptized in this way as infants when they grow up ought to be interrogated, whether they are willing to ratify that which their godparents promised in their name while they were being baptized—let him be accursed" (C. of Trent, Sess. VII. *de Bapt.* Can. 14).

Our reply in Canon 61 was, "they must render an account of their faith" again in the Baptismal Office; "he must hear sermons"—"he must be taught all other things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health"; he must be "further instructed." Again, in the rubric in the

Catechism, he must " in the church " be " instructed and examined," and so on. All this is included and inferred in the word " hereafter " in the Confirmation Office, showing a difference from that which had been the custom before. The mechanical was to cease and the intelligent reception of the truth was to be emphasized. It is quite true that our Lord said, " Suffer the little children to come unto Me," and surely no one would keep them from Him even at the age of a day, but our Lord has other ways of blessing than by means of Confirmation. He did not deal with the children who came to Him as He did with adults.

The Roman and Eastern Churches confirm at an early age. We view with interest all that those great Churches do, but we Churchmen affirm that " Rome hath erred." Rome may be right or wrong, and we do not blindly follow either her teaching or practice. She, like ourselves, has a perfect right to arrange such a matter as the age for Confirmation, for herself, but, as I have shown, we believe that she is mistaken with regard to the " instruction " of candidates ; also we believe her to be in error respecting the age of confirmees. From the words in the Baptismal Office, it might appear that very young children were intended to be confirmed, but those words must be viewed in connexion with the Catechism and the Confirmation Service. In the rubric in the Catechism it says " are come to a *competent* age " ; in the Confirmation Service " years of discretion." Here, again, is a marked change

from the language used in Roman and in our pre-Reformation Prayer Books. It must mean something. "Competent" is competent—"discretion" is discretion. There may be differences of opinion as to what is a competent age. This must be decided finally by the Bishop, as is clearly shown by the last rubric in the Catechism: "And if the *Bishop approve* of them, he shall confirm them." This surely implies that if the Bishop thinks they have been fully instructed and are of competent age, viz., the years of discretion, they shall be confirmed. Otherwise his approval is meaningless. This interpretation of the rubric has been generally accepted since the Reformation.

There may be children of younger age who may be prepared in a real sense more than those of much older age, but a Bishop must weigh all the different factors in the situation and, after seeing in which direction the balance of advantage lies, give his decision accordingly.

When laying stress on the disadvantages that children suffer through not being confirmed earlier, there is a danger of overlooking the fact that they have *already* received the gift of the Holy Spirit in baptism, and that they are not really barred from the fruit of the Spirit. Children of the age of twelve to fourteen should be most carefully watched over, and every effort should be made to keep them in close touch with the Church. If this course is followed, I think that Confirmation will be more likely to be an effective and real help to the growing

boy or girl than if he had been confirmed at an earlier age. Among the advantages to be gained by Confirmation at a later age is this. If a boy is confirmed before he leaves school and goes to work, it is true that he has partaken of *every* means of grace which the Church can give to him through Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Communion. If after this he falls, as alas, so many do, he is strongly tempted to give everything up. He feels it is no use his trying, and his faith in the means of grace is shattered, for they have not kept him, so the priest has very little to go upon in dealing with the lad, who is hopeless concerning himself and the spiritual life. On the other hand, if the parish priest has kept in close touch with the unconfirmed lad when he goes to work and falls, the priest has something on which to rest his appeal when he approaches the lad, who is probably sick with himself and with all the world. He can say to him, "This won't do. You want more help. Here it is. Be confirmed and get to the Holy Communion." This holds out hope to the lad just when he needs it most. I have known scores of such cases. The later age is one which many of the great Caroline divines had in mind, such as Baxter, who said: "Sixteen, seventeen, or eighteen years of age is the time when we have reason to expect that the baptized should seek the Communion and privileges of the adult." Cosin says "that many are confirmed at seven years old," but adds his own opinion "that they should not be confirmed so

young as they used to be, but when they are of perfect age, and ready to be admitted to Holy Communion, which is between fourteen and sixteen years of age."

Dr. Pusey, writing to Mrs. Fletcher in the last year of his life about her son going to Eton, said: "I would not hurry it (Confirmation). I was at Eton several years before I was confirmed." On another occasion he expressed the opinion that Confirmation should be either earlier than sixteen, that it might furnish the grace to resist temptation at a perilous time of life, or later, that it might seal repentance for the sins of an undisciplined youth.

I am not insensible of the fact that much may be said in favour of a very early age, and authorities may be produced advocating the same, but feeling that the weight of evidence is decidedly in favour of a later age I must exercise my discretion and state clearly I cannot regard an earlier age than twelve as "competent," and must ask priests to regard this direction. Whatever differences of opinion there may be regarding the age of a candidate there can be none respecting the necessity for full and adequate preparation for the sacred rite. There must be nothing approaching haste or hurry. In some cases it may be well for candidates to attend classes two or even three years in succession before Confirmation. I think that the minimum number of classes should be twelve. They should provide both instruction and preparation. Neither can be neglected and both must be prepared for by the priest with a thorough-

ness unsurpassed by that which characterizes any of his ministerial duties, for this work is one of the most important of all that is laid upon him by the Church. May I urge men of every school of thought to avoid party bias in their teaching. Let the Evangelical remember that the lad may some time find himself in a parish where the only means of grace are those on High Church lines, and let the High Church incumbent realize that the girl may some time find herself in a strictly Evangelical parish. Don't make it difficult, but rather make it easy for each to settle down in a new parish by having been taught the difference between essentials and non-essentials, between the realities and accessories. Thousands of young people are lost to the Church owing to the preparation for Confirmation being of such a "party" kind that they can never worship in comfort in any way other than that of the Church of their Confirmation period. I know the difficulty, but it should be overcome in the wider interests of the spiritual life of the candidate. The words of Canon Newbolt are worthy of being copied on the front page of every priest's notebook for his classes. He says: "Confirmation candidates are not simply to be drilled in classes, but are individual souls to be saved." These are wise words. They should be remembered. In private interviews with candidates, I always tried to press for real decision for Christ, and for the personal surrender of the whole life to Christ. This is more profitable than making the candidate dwell

upon his past sins. The words in the Confirmation prayer, "continue Thine for ever," imply that previously the great surrender has been made. The great word "Consecration" should be interpreted and applied to the details of everyday life. If this is understood then there is a greater likelihood of the candidate grasping the fact that Confirmation is not a mere corridor to the Holy Communion, but a great occasion, nothing less than his Ordination for service. He is now in truth "not to be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified," but to be His "faithful soldier and servant." The obligation side of Confirmation must be pressed home, and one of the preparation classes at least should deal with the great task of the Church with regard to the winning of the world for Christ. The teaching given should lead them to realize that their Communion is not completed until they have used the strength therein received to help forward the conversion of men for whom the "Bread" was broken and the "Blood" was shed. It is to emphasize this fact that I have requested that at every Confirmation there should be an offertory for any branch of missionary enterprise, so that the coin placed in the bag at such a solemn moment may be an outward and visible sign of the inward determina- into to surrender life itself, in order that Christ's Kingdom may come and His will may be done.

The care of the confirmee must be as vigilant after Confirmation as it was before. The number of lapsed communicants is perilously large. When the

numbers confirmed year by year are remembered, it is an amazing fact that the number of communicants remains almost stationary. I fear the reason is twofold, viz., the lack of adequate preparation before Confirmation, and the lack of sympathy and help afterwards. May I suggest some methods by which help may be rendered?

(*a*) Continuation Classes.—These should not be confined solely to preparation for Holy Communion, but should extend to all branches of Church life and work. Subjects such as Church History, Foreign Missions, the story of great movements in the Church or of the lives of its greatest saints might be dealt with in classes held, say, once a month.

(*b*) The appointment of "Confirmation" godparents.—These should be of the same sex (if possible) as the candidate, and their duty should be to "shepherd" their godchildren through the first years after Confirmation. Experience teaches that frequently, in about six to twelve months after Confirmation, there arrives a dangerous period in which there is a tendency to "reaction," and it is then that a large number of our lapsed communicants first begin to become careless and to fall away. The "Confirmation" godparents are expected to be present at the Confirmation and to sit with the candidates at their first Communion; to arrange to be with them at the Holy Communion at least once a month and at the greater festivals. If they are absent they should be visited, and the vicar should be informed. They should be encouraged in every

possible way and, above all, they should be remembered constantly in prayers. Such a person as "godparent," not fussy, but friendly, and one living near to God, would be a real help to any beginner in the Christian race.

(*c*) A careful Roll of all confirmees should be formed and constantly revised, and all confirmees should be encouraged to notify at once their change of address, even if far removed from the parish. An annual reunion of all those confirmed in the parish can be made of real service, and a personal letter written every year to all those confirmed is invaluable. It involves labour, but is worth double the effort.

(*d*) Service.—A vicar recently showed me, after a Confirmation, a list of his eighty-nine candidates, and by the side of each he had placed the work promised to be done. He had realized the "Laymen's Ordination," and that the power given must be used. But I would emphasize the necessity of not letting a boy think he is fulfilling his duty by singing in the choir or acting as a "server." Something beyond worship in church is implied, for, after all, the time spent in such work is very little. It is real soul-winning which should be made the objective. There is not a word mentioned about the part Andrew played in public worship; in fact very little at all throughout the New Testament concerning its being considered a "Church" activity. "Andrew brought his brother," Philip, Nathanael, and we want to train our Confirmation candidates to realize

that "soul-winning" is the chief work of every confirmed person. This is the kind of work which helps more than anything else to keep the young convert steadfast and reliable.

RESERVATION.—I pass to one of the gravest questions on which I shall speak throughout my Visitation, viz., the Reserved Sacrament, and the use to which it may be put. My brethren, I have prayed for guidance on the question, and I believe it has been given. I have sought advice from the wisest in our Church, and I have been in close and friendly consultation with those who desire to reserve. Therefore, the conclusion to which I have come and the directions which I shall give are not the result of hasty thinking, but are laid before you after much prayer and earnest thought. May the Holy Spirit direct all our hearts.

A learned theological writer of repute of the High Church school of thought said recently: "There is not any Anglican precept for Reservation, Benediction, Exposition, nor for congregational Devotion." He was correct in his statement. The Prayer Book directions are clear. The Sacred Elements are to be reverently consumed at the close of the Communion Service. If the sick require the Holy Communion there is a service provided for them. No reservation for the sick is intended and no service for its use is provided. I need not enter upon the historical reasons which led the compilers of the Prayer Book to adopt such a course. They were weighty and they were sound. But the

conditions of life have altogether changed from those days. Then there was no institution in the world such as the London Hospital. Huge parishes, such as East Ham with its fifty-two thousand people, were practically unknown. The changed conditions have caused Convocation to review the whole situation from the standpoint of the needs of to-day, and they have decided to incorporate in the revised Prayer Book provision for reservation, but stating plainly and definitely that the reserved Sacrament is for the sick, "and that they be not used for any other purpose whatsoever." This is in complete accord with primitive practice, and, personally, I am prepared to allow such reservation, if it is carried out as the rest of the rubric directs, "and after such manner as the Ordinary shall approve"; and again, "if any question arises as to the manner of doing anything that is here enjoined or allowed, it shall be referred to the Ordinary for his decision." Therefore it must be clearly understood that reservation in the Diocese can only be allowed when I have been consulted and my directions carried out. Before reserving, I expect every priest to communicate with me as to what my directions are, and then, and then only, to reserve in strict accordance with them. I am acting in full accordance with the Episcopate of the two Provinces of Canterbury and York in claiming the sole right to regulate the mode of reservation and the use to which the reserved Sacrament is put. The English Episcopate issued last year the following statement :—

"If a Bishop believes that owing to special conditions it is desirable that a parish priest or other minister should be allowed by him to go beyond what would, if the rubrics became law, be set forth as the permissible rule or custom in the Church, his action in giving such sanction will be individual and exceptional, and will lie outside what the Episcopate has assented to. Should a Bishop so exercise his administrative responsibility, any instruction that he gives either as to the place or manner of such reservation should be in accordance with the principle that the reserved Sacrament is to be used for the Communion of the sick, and for no other purpose whatsoever."

After making this public and official statement, I shall naturally expect that my directions will be loyally carried out in the letter and in the spirit. They are :—

(1) That the place and manner of the reservation must be according to my directions, and that any priest desiring reservation must inform me.

(2) That in every case of the Communion of the sick, the sick persons shall have freely and genuinely offered a celebration in the sick-room, if they desire it.

(3) The reservation must be of both kinds and the administration must be in both kinds. It is not my intention to enter into a reasoned statement as to my reasons for this direction excepting to call your attention to—

(*a*) The earliest reference to reservation is that

made by Justin Martyr, in which he says: "The deacons gave to every one that was present to partake of the bread and the wine mixed with water, and that they carried them to those not present." This was the primitive custom.

(*b*) The fact that in the days of Chrysostom, reservation in both kinds was evidently the rule, for it is stated that in the church of St. Sophia, at Constantinople, the spilling of "the most holy blood of Christ" occurred as the result of a riot.

(*c*) That the Church of England evidently and without doubt orders the separate cup and the separate administration.

(*d*) That reverence can be maintained for the cup, in reserving for the sick. It was so in the early Church. It is so in the Church of Scotland to-day, and the Cup is carried by numbers of spiritually minded men in perfect safety to the sick.

I am aware that the custom of Intinction is advocated by some among us, but I believe such custom to be devoid of primitive authority, contrary to the teaching and practice of our Church, and, above all, is out of harmony with the spirit and intention of our Lord at the time of the Institution. Therefore I must direct that all reservation must be distinctly in both kinds and that every administration to the sick must be in the same. I feel sure that such a plain direction issued by me will be loyally observed by every priest no matter what his personal views may be.

(4). That the object of the reservation of the

Elements is, as is defined in the rubric in the revised Prayer Book, for the "Communion of the sick," and that they be not used for any other purpose whatsoever. This is the decision of the four Houses of Convocation in this country. Has any priest any right or authority to go beyond it? Reservation as so ordered meets the demand made for years in the name of the sick and their needs. During the last few years, however, claims have been made and practices introduced which are contrary to all that was asked for and are contrary to all that is here directed. Some clergy, few in number, have introduced the service of "Benediction" and "Devotions to the Sacrament."

I do not challenge the excellent motives of those who have made these claims. They are no doubt spiritually minded men who are really anxious to promote the spiritual life of their people, but their claim cannot be allowed nor their practices sanctioned. I trust that what I say may be couched in language full of sympathy, with a deep sense of responsibility and with the realization that we are speaking of something connected with the Sacrament of our Redemption, and I pray that every word may be spoken in love as becomes your Father-in-God in the Church of our Saviour Christ.

Neither "Benediction" nor "Devotions to the Sacrament" can be recognized as either Catholic practices or as practices sanctioned or allowable within the English Church. With regard to "Benediction."

(1) It is not a Catholic practice and lays no claim to being so. It is not practised in the Eastern Church at all, and neither was it practised in the Roman Church until the sixteenth century. It is purely and essentially a Roman service, and this no historian would deny.

(2) It has no authority within the English Church. It is not part of her Catholic heritage. Let me bring before you proof on this point from a Roman, an American, and an English source.

(*a*) A Roman statement from the *Tablet* :—

"'Benediction' is not an old rite used in England before the Reformation. It cannot be defended on the plea of restoring the ancient ceremonies of their own ancient Church. . . . Nor is it Catholic in the High Anglican sense. It is unknown in that Eastern branch of the Church which is so mighty an ally in proving that what is Roman is not necessarily Catholic." Again says the *Tablet*, "from the point of view of the Pope himself, it is neither necessary nor universal nor ancient. . . . Let these zealous Anglo-Catholics ask any real Catholic priest whether 'Benediction' is of so great importance. They will be told that there is nothing vital in this service. Our own Uniates are quite good Catholics without it. But obedience to the lawful Catholic Bishop of your diocese is vital. "Benediction may not be held except by special leave of the Ordinary."

In view of the source from which the above springs, the statements are remarkable and significant.

(*b*) An American statement.

In 1907 the American House of Bishops declared that "the reservation of the Sacrament for purposes of worship is unwarranted by our Lord's Institution of the Sacrament, and unprovided for in our formularies.

(*c*) The English Church position.

As the *Tablet* states, the service of "Benediction" was not used in this country previous to the Reformation. Therefore it must be remembered that those clergy who introduce "Benediction" into their churches are doing so for *the first time in the history of the Church of England.* Have they realized the tremendous responsibility which they are taking upon themselves? It seems almost inconceivable that men calling themselves Catholics should in the year 1920 demand a service which has never in all its long history been recognized or practised within the English Church.

I ask, therefore, by what authority such a service is held. Not by any authority derived from either Catholic or English sources. Has any English priest the right to introduce any practice, however beautiful, on the mere authority of the Roman Church and that of a very late date?

With regard to "Devotions to the Sacrament," let me apply the same tests here. Are such either Catholic or English?

(*a*) The Catholic Church never sanctioned what are commonly known as "Devotions to the Sacrament?" Freestone, in his masterly work on Reservation, says, "There is yet (i.e. before 1215) no

trace to be found of any custom in which the presence of Christ is secured for the Church out of Mass time for the purpose of Devotion."

Dr. Pusey, in a letter dated June 13th, 1882, wrote :—

"There is absolutely no authority in the early Church for reservation except for the sick, nor for placing the Blessed Sacrament in a monstrance or censing, still less of blessing the people with it. This last seems to me a most unjustifiable use of the Presence which He vouchsafes us. He gave it for one end ; He never authorized us to use His Gracious Presence for another."

(*b*) The English Church has not sanctioned such practices. Need I labour this point ? Such "Devotions to the Sacrament" are absolutely unknown among us, and there is absolutely no authority derivable from an English source for any such service being held in any English church.

We see, therefore, that the service of "Benediction" and those of "Devotions to the Sacrament" are neither of primitive nor of English origin, nor possessed of Catholic or English authority. This being so, neither can be allowed within the English Church. There are other reasons against their introduction.

(1) We long for reunion—reunion with the Eastern Church, reunion with our Nonconformist friends living among us. Is it likely that the introduction of either of these practices will further the cause of reunion with either ? Again, if ever there was a time when, in the interests of the world and of the

nation, the Church herself should be united and free from internal controversy, it is now. Is a violent agitation on behalf of such "Devotions" likely to promote harmony or to wreck it? In former struggles, a United Catholic Party struggled for what they believed was ordered by the Prayer Book, or, at any rate, had the authority of the Catholic Church behind it. Now we see a division—one group asking for uses of the Blessed Sacrament which derive any authority they possess from a purely Roman source, and are in no sense covered or contemplated by the Prayer Book, while another group ask for reservation solely for the Communion of the sick. So that this controversy, if prolonged, is likely to break up the Catholic party into two camps, and, at the same time, distress large numbers of the faithful, and demand the attention of the Bishops and authorities of the Church, and all this at a time of unparalleled opportunity and responsibility. Is it worth while and is it in accord with the spirit of our Divine Lord that that which He has given us should be used to divide us and to rend His Church in twain?

(2) The English Church is known for her well-balanced doctrinal teaching. The introduction of such services must affect our doctrinal position, as it has the Roman in *practice* if not authoritatively. Wherever such practices have become dominant, the work of the Holy Spirit has tended to become ignored in practice. Let me remind you of the monumental devotional books of the famous Loyola.

In them there is not a single meditation devoted to the Holy Spirit, or the work of the Holy Spirit within the soul. Again, the works of the most famous preachers in the French Church, Bossuet and Massillon, contain not a sermon on the same subject. I have bought a number of manuals for use when praying in the "Presence" or joining in "Devotions," and I am struck with the same absence and the same ignoring of the Holy Spirit. I cannot myself harmonize such services with our Lord's saying, "It is expedient for you that I go away" or with, "Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed." On the other hand I am alarmed at what is already being taught in connexion with such "Devotions." In church after church a friend of mine found on sale a little manual called *Fifteen Minutes before the Blessed Sacrament.* It is supposed to be used by a child "within the Presence" and the Christ all through is supposed to be speaking to the child. Towards the close, Christ has these words put into His mouth: "My little one, love, above all, my own sweet glorious mother—she is your mother. O love her, speak to her often, and she will bring you to me and *for her sake* I will love and bless you more each day."

This is the teaching in many English churches *after only a few years of "Devotions" in our midst.* All history shows that when once the Sacred Elements are used for any other purpose than for that we are *certain* our Lord intended, then the Church has, sooner or later, had to deal with grave abuses in

connexion therewith. To name only a few such—burying the Elements with the dead, enclosing them on the altar in the same way as relics—wearing them as a charm—and it is significant that many of the regulations concerning the Sacraments made by Councils and Synods relate to irregularities which had crept in owing to reservation. The risk relating to reservation even for the sick is great, but the Church has decided to take it. This throws upon us all, responsibility for seeing that what she allows is used only and solely for the purpose prescribed and understood.

(3) Did our Lord ordain the Lord's supper for the purpose of either "Benediction "or "Devotion ?" The answer must be "No, He did not." This being so, is it allowable for any disciple to use, even for a moment, that which His Lord gave for a certain purpose, for some other purposes, however laudable or helpful they may be ? Personally, my reverence to my Lord would absolutely prevent my taking part in any such services. That which is so clearly and definitely my Lord's must be used only for that which He ordained, and for that purpose for which I am certain He intended it.

One more point. It is argued that opposition to "Benediction" or to "Devotions" is an attack upon the doctrine of the Real Presence. This does not follow at all. Pusey, whose work on the Real Presence is the standard work on that question, said, "Christ gave the Sacrament for one end. He has never authorized us to use His gracious Pres-

ence for another. No one has told us that He does bless us so."

Bishop Gore holds a similar view, as do other leading advocates of the doctrine of the Real Presence, and they are right.

Before closing my remarks on this question, may I utter one word of warning and of caution? I cannot fail to realize that some clergy are rushing to the help of their brother priests who have practised "Benediction" in what they consider a time of persecution, and their defence for doing so is that the Courts in which the cases have been tried are unsatisfactory. Only last week in the Upper House of Convocation, I moved the following resolution, which was carried:—

"That this House is of opinion that the reform of ecclesiastical courts demands immediate attention, and trusts that the National Assembly will, at the earliest opportunity, consider the question with a view to action being taken either under the Enabling Act, or in other ways, so to amend existing procedure that discipline may be restored and maintained with the general good will of the Church."

This is evidence that I am alive to the position created by the failure of our ecclesiastical procedure, but I want you to consider: Is it wise, is it right, is it in accord with Catholic practice, for priests to sign a petition practically condemning a Bishop for actions which he has taken in certain courts, and absolutely ignoring the uncanonical action of the priest concerned? The real person

to be condemned is the priest who refuses to render that canonical obedience to his Bishop which every Church in Christendom would say he ought to render. The readiness to condemn the courts and to excuse the disobedience of the priest concerned, is contrary to all Catholic ideas of discipline and authority

I am acting in full accord with Catholic Order in refusing to authorize or permit the service of "Benediction" or "Devotions," while allowing reservation for the sick. Lord Phillimore, in a letter to the *Church Times*, August 8, 1919, said: "In the particular service of 'Benediction' of the Blessed Sacrament there can be no doubt that in every part of the Church where it is practised, the direction to discontinue it would be held to be such a legitimate exercise (i.e., of the canonical authority of the Bishop), it not being a rite or appointed service of the Church."

Before leaving this question may I quote some words from the Royal Commission in 1906, with which I fully agree:

"First, the law of public worship in the Church of England is too narrow for the religious life of the present generation. It needlessly condemns much which a great section of Church people, including many of her devoted members, value; and modern thought and feeling are characterized by a care for ceremonial, a sense of dignity in worship and an appreciation of the continuity of the Church, which were not similarly felt at the time

when the law took its present shape. With an adequate power of self-adjustment, we might reasonably expect that revision of the strict letter of the law would be undertaken with such due regard for the living mind of the Church as would secure the obedience of many, now dissatisfied, who desire to be loyal, and would justify the Church, as a whole, in insisting in the obedience of all."

Something in the direction recommended by the Royal Commission has been done. A new Lectionary has been provided. Great changes have been made in the Prayer Book, and much has been done to enrich the services of our Church. That more is needed I do not deny, but clergy should not revise the Prayer Book themselves. That is the work of the whole Church. While waiting for alterations which we may desire, we must be loyal to that which we possess. The well-known words of Pusey are worthy of remembrance, " Beauty, ritual, music, are all helps. If we cannot have the very ritual some of us wish, we have the Faith and the Truth of God, and Holy Scripture, and the Fathers and the Prayer Book and the Holy Eucharist."

The Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Worship is well worthy of careful study, but no priest has any right to appeal to it as giving to any individual priest authority to try any experiment he wishes in the services of his church without reference to his Bishop and without obtaining from him the necessary authority. I believe in wide toleration, but there are limits bounded by our doc-

trine and rules beyond which I cannot permit men to go. It is often far easier for a Bishop to say "yes" to the request of a zealous and spiritually minded priest than to refuse his request, but a Bishop is bound by his Consecration to guard the *jus liturgicum* and to confine it within a certain well-defined sphere. Therefore I appeal to clergy to accept my ruling on the various points submitted to me, realizing that they are made not hastily, but carefully, not in any party sense, but with a deep realization of the comprehensive nature of the Church. I feel certain I shall not appeal in vain.

Before we separate let the clergy present realize their own position when leading their people in their worship. What mean ye by this service? Is it something ordered and therefore to be taken? or are we really glad when the bell rings and bids us go into the House of the Lord? I cannot imagine any condition more terrible to contemplate or one more likely to deaden the spiritual life than for a priest to go through any service of the Church in a cold and mechanical manner. Yet priests, more than many would imagine, have told me that they had reached this stage and that they said the prayers but did not pray! that they sang and yet did not worship. They hold on to their living, for they cannot turn to any other calling. Is it so with any here? I trust not, but if there should be, I hope that he will seek an early opportunity of opening his heart to me his Father-in-God. At all cost a man

in such a plight must face the situation. What is the cause of such a collapse? Two causes generally operate either together or alone. Behind it all there is something in the life of the priest which he knows to be out of harmony with his profession, or he has neglected his private communion with God. The latter is frequently the cause of the former. I remember some time ago a priest who had fallen into grievous sin saying to me: "For two years I have never once knelt in prayer, unless I have been taking duty"—for two years never kneeling in prayer and yet all the time baptizing little children, training Confirmation candidates, consecrating and administering the Sacred Elements! It seems almost incredible, but it was true. To all of us there surges up within our hearts a feeling almost akin to horror as we think of the hypocrisy of the life, but are we so without sin that we can cast a stone at such a man? Are our prayers real and free from formalism? It is from private prayers that we should pass to public prayer. I know how easily habits are formed, and when once formed the difficulty of realizing the full effect they have upon our lives; but my solemn charge to you is, "Examine yourself. Test your concentration on your Lord when you are in His House and if you find you have lost your reality, seek for it at His feet, for there only will it be found."

But I know you, my brothers, and I thank God for your devoted lives and heroic and self-denying labours. Although I have been compelled to speak

to-day at length on grave irregularities I realize that although they may be large in the aggregate, the number of those affected is small in comparison with the large number of devoted servants of our Lord and His Church. Some among you may be discouraged, some may have felt the lack of recognition, others again may be finding the fight keen and the struggle long. To one and all I say, "Your Master is with you. Remember He who said 'Go' said likewise, 'I am with you always,' and as you wend your way back to crowded town or the loneliness of country hamlet I pray God your eyes may be opened and you may see the King in His beauty by your side saying to you: 'Fear thou not, for I am with thee! be not dismayed, for I am thy God! I will strengthen thee! yea, I will help thee! yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of My righteousness.'"

CHAPTER IV

THE CHURCH AND SOME OF THE PROBLEMS BEFORE HER

FOLLOWING upon the addresses already delivered I call your attention to the Church and some of the problems before her, such as those associated with the State, labour, morality as affected by impurity and intemperance, and the proposed extension of divorce; and such questions as reunion and women's work.

1. LABOUR.—England is seething with unrest. Every department of labour is in an electrical condition. The England of our boyhood has gone, and no one can prophesy concerning the England our children's children will possess. Despite appearances to the contrary, I do not think that the root of the difficulty is wages, but rather the fact that the life of the wage-earner is cribbed, cabined and confined. The atmosphere is wrong. If the Church had fulfilled her task the tone of the country to-day would have been different. If the Church is to rise to her duty to the world of which she is supposed to be the "light" as well as the "salt" she must deal first with her own members, and imbue

them with the character and aims which she wishes the nation to possess. The apathy which has allowed "slum" land to remain, and sweating to continue for so many years, must give place to keenness concerning the growth of the Kingdom of God in every department of the life of the nation. But the members of the Church must be taught—

(*a*) To live themselves up to the Christian standard of life. There must be less separation of creed from conduct. When the Employers' Liability Act passed, a prominent Churchman said to me it would cost him ten thousand pounds to put safeguards in his works, but the insurance companies and the law were compelling him to do so. When the lives and well-being of his workpeople were the only consideration he had never troubled. At Bethnal Green I found one of the worst bits of "slum" property was owned by a most strenuous worker of the Church who *had never visited it*, but simply drawn the rents through an agent. The Christian must be taught his duty to apply the principles of the faith he holds to every detail of his daily life.

(*b*) To realize their duty as citizens. They must take their place in both municipal and national life. Politics must cease to be to them a game of party and become a means of answering their prayer, "Thy Kingdom come." The "Treaty of Peace" and its resolutions on labour should be made known by clergy to their people. Never before in any treaty of peace have there been embodied such clauses, and yet they are in danger of being

inoperative owing to the apathy of the moral and spiritual forces of the nation. Have the clergy themselves studied them? In many aspects the Sermon on the Mount is incorporated in the Treaty, and yet His disciples know it not. Therefore—

(*c*) To study the great questions of the day is an obligation which must be undertaken. On the whole labour is better informed on these questions than is the Church. The members of the Labour Party are reading more than the members of either the Conservative or Liberal party. Where among the latter is found anything like, for instance, the Ruskin classes, now being held among the miners in South Wales? The Christian must pray for the open mind and the avoidance of prejudice. The Labour Party is seeking for full life. Even the strikes for a minimum wage and the hostility to payment by results have their good points, for in the minds of many Labour men there lies the seed of the Divine teaching that the strong must bear the infirmity of the weak, and that it is in "bearing one another's burdens" that the law of Christ is fulfilled. In many a strike highly-paid men have lost heavily simply in order to help their less successful brothers to a better life. Labour is largely religious in its sentiments and ideals. Frequently the name of Christ is cheered while the Church is hissed, for men do not see in her members the life lived by her Lord. We thank God for the Christian Labour leaders in England such as Henderson, Adamson and Barnes, but they must be backed in

their efforts to keep the Labour movement on right lines by the earnest efforts of the Christian community.

But the question arises, how is this to be done? Let me briefly make suggestions.

(1) There must be no attempt to patronize Labour. To do so is as impossible as it is unwise and unchristian, but on the other hand, the Church must do nothing to conciliate Labour by means which would involve the sacrifice of principles or which would interfere with her duty to the whole community. Labour must be governed by the same principles which apply to the rest of mankind. The principles of Christ are of universal application, and are equally applicable to Labour as to the Capitalist, to the Englishman as to the Chinese. Labour is not a class apart from the rest of mankind, with different rules of conduct and of life. This point requires emphasizing to-day. The Church is to be the servant and teacher of the whole nation and not only to any one part, however important.

(2) The Church must not merely utter platitudes. Her programme for the nation must be as instinct with life and warmth as is the Sermon on the Mount which is really her programme, but it must be put in operation in the life of the individual, of the nation and of the world.

(3) It is important to teach that the Church has a different function from that of her members. We are constantly asked: "Why does not the

Church do this or that ?" We must show that the work of the Church is to *teach,* to infuse the world with right principles, and through the Cross by the working of the Holy Spirit so to imbue the world with the Christian spirit that men willingly put these principles into action. Let me illustrate :—

(*a*) It is the duty of the Church to declare the value and sacredness of human life. In comparison wealth and property are of little value. It was to save life that Christ came and that Christ died. Therefore—

(*b*) It is the duty of the Church to teach that a living wage must be paid, but it is not within her province to *fix* what that wage should be. But she must insist on every man having the right to a chance to live, to move and to have his being. It is also her duty to teach responsibility for the right use of money whether received as dividends or as wages. Again, because human life is of such great value the Church must teach—

(*c*) The duty of the State to make the conditions of life satisfactory. God gave laws to the Jew relating to the building of his house, and gave him laws of health which have never been surpassed. The Church must insist on the decent house and the proper hours of leisure which every man should possess, but she should likewise teach men how to make the decent house into a Christian home, and how to use his increased hours of leisure that they become to men a blessing and not a curse.

(*d*) That the law of God is work. "Six days

shalt thou labour," was in the old command, and the law given by our blessed Lord is that he who would be the greatest must be the servant of all. But if Labour is to reach its highest dignity it must not be primarily for the benefit of self, but as a man's contribution to the welfare of the community. Whether a Christian be a so-called master or man, his work should be in the spirit of one who said recently, " I don't like to think I have four thousand men in my employ, but rather that I have the best interests of four thousand men to serve." This is the spirit which should be cultivated. If it is, there will be less exploitation of labour, and less talk of inferior work. The connexion between the way in which work is done and the formation of character must be shown, for no man can long do inferior work to that of which he is capable without becoming himself inferior, and on the other hand no employer can dwell too much on his profits without thinking less and less of the claims of those in his employ.

These are some of the points on which the Church can and ought to lay stress. The future welfare of labour and of the world will depend upon the success with which the Church can impregnate both with the principles and spirit of Christ. To this end I strongly advise that in every parish efforts should be made to get into touch with Labour, and especially with any of its responsible leaders who may reside within it, and that friendly talks and conferences should be arranged. The priests who

use the words: "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . preserve thy body," are under a special obligation to do all within their power to preserve the bodies of men, but, after all, only in order that they may become fit "temples of the Holy Ghost," and the better instruments for the Master Himself to use. Running through all our teaching on Labour it must be remembered that "man does not live by bread alone," and that man can only find rest for his soul, purity in his heart, and strength in his life when he has found Christ to be his Saviour. Therefore, I once more remind you that the Cross is the only hope for Labour, as it is for the whole world.

Social and Moral Problems.—It is impossible to consider the question of Labour apart from the great moral and social questions with which it is so intimately connected, such as temperance, purity, housing, observance of Sunday, and recreation.

(*a*) *Temperance.*—The growth of public opinion among all classes in favour of temperance has been most marked, especially among the educated classes, but even so, the loss to the country by the drink traffic is greater than the loss sustained by any other cause. Such a state of affairs cannot continue without serious and possibly irretrievable harm to the State.

I am not writing as a Prohibitionist. Personally, I do not think that England is ripe for such a step to be taken, but at the same time I do not rule out Prohibition as either impossible or unwise. At

this stage I think that every lover of his country, whether he be a teetotaller or a brewer, must sink his own prejudices, and even, if necessary, sacrifice his habits of many years' standing, if by so doing he can help to rebuild England on surer and stronger lines. The question which should decide our attitude not only to the drink traffic, but to all such questions is: "Will this course tend to strengthen or weaken the national life?" Apply this to the drink traffic.

(1) Is it in the national interest that nearly four hundred millions should be spent in one year on intoxicants? I am quoting from the figures compiled by Mr. George B. Wilson. The drink bill for 1919 was forty-nine per cent. more than in 1918, and no less than 132 per cent. larger than in 1913. The average expenditure on drink by adults of twenty-one and upwards in 1913 was £5 19s. per head. In 1919 it had risen to £13 15s. per head. The nation is overloaded with debt. There is a stern call and necessity for economy. Does the drink traffic lead men to respond to such an appeal?

(2) Did the drink traffic of the last twenty years make England stronger and more ready for the Great War or was the reverse the case? Were, for instance, the number of men rejected during the late war increased or decreased by the operations of the drink traffic? Again, the future of the race depends largely on the health and character of the women of the land. In 1918, in England and Wales, 7,121 women were convicted of drunkenness. In

1919 the number had increased to 10,875, while in Scotland the figures had jumped from 3,878 to 6,697. Are facts such as these calculated to strengthen or weaken the coming race? The Government have issued an appeal for increased production of those things which will permanently increase the wealth of this country. Will the increased production of intoxicants have that effect? Does the testimony of employers of labour confirm the opinion that it does? The Prime Minister did not appear to think so when he practically stated that drink was a greater menace to this country than was Germany. It is said that "under Prohibition the workers (in the United States) are restless and discontented." May I suggest that the same words might be applied equally to the workers in "wet" England. Does this statement apply to such States as Kansas, where Prohibition has been in force many years, or to other States where it has just been introduced and affairs are in a transitional stage?

(3) In the poorer areas of large towns such as in the east and south of London, is the drink traffic a blessing or a curse? Does it tend to uplift or degrade the people? Are the lives of women and of children the happier, the more healthy because of its existence in their midst?

The question which we in England have to face is of vital importance, viz., Is the drink traffic, on the whole, one which builds up character, makes men stronger in body, purer in heart and life, and

more keen to "Fear God and honour the King" (the State)?

That is the question which America has faced. She may have answered wisely or unwisely, but one hundred million Americans with the largest and most powerful Labour organization in the world could not have gone "dry" merely at the will of a set of fanatical teetotallers. Somehow or other a very large percentage of the reliable, sane, level-headed members of the community must have been converted to the idea that the drink traffic was a menace to the welfare of the State and as such must be abolished. They may have been mistaken, but it is the duty of every lover of England to try and collect the evidence by which they arrived at that conclusion, to sift it carefully, and then to ascertain whether it does or does not apply to this country. The question is so important that a decision must be reached not by way of prejudice, but by the open mind, and a sincere desire to think rightly and to act wisely in the interests of the whole community.

May I recommend you to read *The Anti-Saloon Year-book for* 1919, *or Facts, Figures and Arguments*, by G. B. Wilson, B.A., both of which can be obtained from the U.K. Alliance, 1, Victoria Street, S.W.1. I do not ask you to accept the conclusions at which the writers arrive, but the facts stated and which are based on official documents are worthy of the consideration of all Christian workers.

Sex Problems.—This is one of the most important problems which the Church has to face and one

of the most difficult. From recent Royal Commissions and from other sources, the nation has realized, more probably than ever before, the deadening influence upon the nation and its manhood and womanhood that vice exerts in one form or another. As citizens we must press upon Parliament the absolute necessity for more stringent legislation dealing with certain aspects of this question. Side by side with such action we must strengthen the excellent work which is being done so quietly and yet so efficiently by our Diocesan Union for Preventive, Rescue and Penitentiary Work.' I regret exceedingly that the Christian community as a whole has really never thrown itself into work of this nature. Funds for this work are altogether inadequate. You will expect from me to-day some words relating to the Bill for the extension of the causes for divorce which is now before Parliament. The Bill proposes to permit divorce for causes other than that of adultery, viz., desertion, insanity, drunkenness, cruelty. We admit that the present law inflicts hardship upon individuals, but is there a single law operating in commerce or industry which does not do likewise? Laws are passed for the general good of the community, and we maintain that any regulations, laws or acts which violate the law of God, work in the end to the disadvantage of the community, and so we take our stand on the law of marriage as laid down by our Blessed Lord, and for us His teaching is absolute. My first vote in the House of Lords was against this

Bill, and I am glad to think it was so. If the Bill reaches the House of Commons, I trust that Christian men and women will organize in every constituency in the Diocese and state boldly and fearlessly what their attitude will be towards any Member of Parliament who supports this measure. The Bill proposes that although no priest is to be compelled to perform the marriage of a person thus divorced, he may lend his Church for the purpose if requested to do so, and that the marriage can take place according to the Church of England service if the parties can find a clergyman to marry them. I hope we may carry an amendment stating definitely that all marriages under the Bill must be at the Registry Office. But if the clause is carried as it stands, I shall expect the clergy and laity to stand loyally by me to a man in resisting by every means in my power any marriage under this Act being performed in any church in this Diocese. For such a marriage to take place in a consecrated building and by the form we use and by a priest in the Church of God is unthinkable. If the State desires such marriages to be celebrated, the State must provide for them, but we, as followers of our Lord, say plainly and clearly that we will have no part or lot in such unholy alliances. But our action must not be of a purely negative character. We must teach and instruct our young people more than we have hitherto done upon the Christian obligation of purity and of marriage. This will be of increasing importance if the Bill becomes law. The Church has been

greatly to blame in not putting clearly before our young people the high ideals of marriage as laid down both in the New Testament and the service in the Prayer Book. I advise that a course of sermons should be preached in every church on this question, taking care that they do not mainly consist of declarations against divorce, or even of affirming the indissolubility of marriage, but that they are of a positive and instructive character dealing with the relation of the sexes, purity, careful consideration before betrothal, ideals of marriage as in the service. Such teaching is a necessity if the future generation is to hold the views on marriage as taught by the Church and as received from her Lord.

Housing and Poor Law Institutions.—Closely allied to the question of purity and of health is that of the housing of the people. I wish that on some Sunday in the year the whole question of the relation of religion to social problems could be dealt with.

The Jew in the old dispensation was not left in doubt as to the connexion between the two. The house in which he lived must have its battlement and must be built in accordance with principles clearly laid down. The census in 1911 revealed how Churchmen and Christians generally had allowed by their apathy and indifference the homes of the people to become so overcrowded as to be dangerous alike to the health and morals of the community. We have yet to learn the present position when next the census is taken, but may I point out that in 1901 in the whole county of Essex (outside the borough of

West Ham) the number of overcrowded persons (more than two to the room) was 22,010 or 2·7 per cent. In 1911 it was 47,906 or 4·7 per cent., divided between 37,744 in urban districts and *not* country boroughs, and 10,252 or 4·1 per cent. in rural districts, or almost double the figures of 1901. They must, I fear, have again doubled during the last ten years. If Christian laymen had been alive to their duty and responsibility surely such a state of affairs would never have arisen. The fact is that while the Church has been faring sumptuously the Lazarus at the gate has been left to his fate unaided. The Borough Councils and the Boards of Guardians have too frequently received little attention on the part of the Christian community. I wonder in how many churches throughout the Diocese a notice was given out on the Sunday before the last Board of Guardians election calling attention to it and bidding the congregation to remember that it is largely through the Poor Law system that to-day the Apostolic injunction is carried out which is implied in the words, " Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this : to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction."

Can it be believed that when the care of tens of thousands of aged and infirm old men and women and of scores of thousands of children was concerned, only seven per cent. of electors went to the trouble of going to the poll ? Did the clergy dwell on this scandal the Sunday following the election or were we all, clergy and laity alike, so busy in going up to

the temple to pray, or busy with some gathering of a guild, that we had no time for such a Christlike work as that of caring for the outcast, the poor, and the needy?

While these problems are left unsolved a state of affairs exists which destroys both the souls and the bodies of men, and the whole Church is commissioned to be to the world a teacher, a healer, a comforter. The responsibility of the Church must be realized, and her sons and daughters must not merely sing, but they must actually march to the war and fight the evils in their midst.

Sunday.—I ask you to give serious consideration to the observance of Sunday, as a day of rest, worship, and spiritual refreshment. During the war, from the nature of the case, men have, in many instances, abandoned their old views of Sunday. They have marched, played games, bought and sold and largely lived as on other days of the week. They have returned home, and being largely creatures of habit, are proceeding to live along those lines. I am strongly of opinion that unless this tendency is checked, serious injury will be done physically, mentally, and spiritually to the manhood and womanhood of the country. It is often forgotten that pleasure for some means work for many. I have been told that in 1913 no less than four million passengers were carried, on the average, by trams, buses, and on the underground trains and tubes in London on the Lord's Day. Think of the labour involved and the impossibility of a vast number of

people making Sunday a day of rest or of worship. It is so easy to ask, " What is the harm of tennis, cricket and so on ? " or to say, " People might do worse." Such statements do not meet the case.

From a long experience of the working classes in the East End of London, I can conceive of few proposals more calculated to injure the moral and spiritual forces of the country than that which would usher in Sunday games by the authority of such bodies as the County or Borough Councils. The games would be played just at the time which is devoted by Christian organizations of every sort to work among the young, and for the purpose of evangelizing the masses. The boy who did not join in a Sunday game would very soon become an object of scorn on the part of numbers of those around him, and the difficulties would be immeasurably increased. I trust, therefore, that you, clergy and laity alike, may do all that you can to thwart that which has much against it and little to be said in favour of it.

May I suggest certain questions to be brought before your congregations.

First. Do you believe in God, and, if so, do you consider He has any right to your time, for worship, prayer and meditation ? Do you believe that God gave a command that one day out of seven should be kept for such purposes ? What did our Lord mean when He said, " The Son of Man *is* Lord also of the Sabbath day " ? Do you mean to do as He directs for the welfare of men or do you not ? If not,

how do you reconcile such refusal with your profession as a believer?

Secondly. Do you believe you have a soul, immortal, and that it is of greater importance than the body, and that its interests and benefit *must* come before all else? Do you believe this really and truly, and do you show your belief by the care you take of it and the time you spend on it?

Thirdly. If you believe in the Christian view of the soul, of eternity, of God and His Christ, do you think *one* day in seven is too much to give for the consideration of those things which, according to your faith, are of the most vital importance to you here and throughout eternity? For six days you are primarily attending to the body, working to provide it with food, clothing and house, and in your spare time you are taking exercise or physical and mental rest. If this is so, do you not consider that one day in the week may be well given up to your highest interests, to the moral and spiritual elements in life?

These are some of the questions which I desire the clergy to press upon their people. Forty or fifty years ago, when men were working six days per week and twelve to sixteen hours per day, some excuse might be made for making Sunday a day of recreation and pleasure, but to-day there is no such excuse. Hours of labour are being shortened, and rightly so, on every hand; holidays are being lengthened, and even the "Daylight-saving Bill" is adding to the hours for pleasure and recreation, and yet it is a

time that the demand is being made for Sunday games and amusements. Such proposals ignore all that Sunday has meant and stood for in England in past days, and how it has helped to inculcate that spirit which has been so manifest during the past five years. It was said that England's wars were won on the playing fields of Eton. I doubt it. I would rather say that they were won on the English Sunday, in the Sunday Schools and Bible Classes, where boys and girls learned the great lesson of sacrifice and unselfishness. To lower the ideal of Sunday is to undermine that which goes far to build up the best in the national character. More work, more pleasure on Sunday means less moral and spiritual power to the nation, and we have not got such a reserve of either that we can afford to lessen the output. We shall need power in the days before us. Do not let us misuse the day of opportunity.

Recreation.—One word as to recreation. Have we instructed our people in the use of time? If we have preached on "Redeeming the time," have we dealt with the question of the use of leisure? I have made inquiries among numbers of our young people as to the use they are making of the longer hours of leisure. Apart from those who are preparing for some examination connected with their profession I rarely find any young person who has definitely set aside a part of their leisure time for serious reading and study. It has not occurred to them to do so. Again I have asked numbers of them whether now they have more time they had offered to visit a

district or to take up more definitely Church work, or to join a "Study Circle" for Church history, Foreign Missions, or social problems. I very rarely get an answer in the affirmative. In reply to further questions I have found that the increased leisure has simply meant more time at the cinema, at sport, or in walking the streets without any definite aim. Frankly, the Church is largely to blame, and in Confirmation classes the whole question of the use of leisure should be discussed, having regard to the proportion of time allotted to recreation and its best use, and the proportion of time for self-improvement and for religious and social service. Positive teaching on this question is necessary and important. The inner meaning of St. Paul's teaching, "whether we eat or whether we drink, let us do all to the glory of God," should be interpreted and expanded to include the whole life of the Christian. The idea so prevalent that so long as there is "no harm" in some recreation it may be freely indulged in must give place to the higher consideration as to whether it is the *best* use of the hour of leisure, and whether body, mind, and spirit would not be the better if some other form of recreation or some other use of the leisure were found. Here is the opportunity of the Church to press home the application of the "ideal" life not as one of mere sentiment, but of active and joyful application to all that concerns life, whether of worship, work, or leisure. Thus all clubs and organizations connected with the Church for men, lads, women, or girls should either be

maintained at the highest level of efficiency and tone, or discontinued. Better that the Church should be without any clubs at all than that anything connected with it should be maintained at a low level and set a poor example to other clubs in the district. The men's club should be one concerning which especial care is exercised and the Young Men's Institute should be of a type that will appeal to the manly and best instincts in a youth.

Although perhaps not intimately connected with the question of recreation it may be well to speak now upon the organizations for boys and girls which deal with both during their hours of leisure.

Boys.—Some time ago I appointed a small committee to deal with the boys' work in the Diocese. Very few of the forms of inquiry which were then sent out were returned, and these often provided but scant information, so that it is impossible to draw dependable deductions from them. But they tend to show that of an estimated population of 73,700 boys, only 8,700 are attached to parochial organizations. It would appear that only thirty parishes in the Diocese have adopted the work of the Church Lads' Brigade Cadets. There are two possibilities before the Cadet movement—either mere military training of our lads, or the training of the whole lad, body, soul and spirit, on a spiritual, moral, social, and educational basis. In a word, the formation of Christian citizenship, to which military efficiency, though real, is subsidiary. The claim of the C.L.B. upon the Church is that it is the

only Church society which bases the training of the elder lads upon definitely religious grounds. With regard to the country, the success of the C.L.B. during the past thirty years has brought the authorities to see the value of this sort of training for lads, and they have urged the extension of the Cadet movement in all directions. Yet quite unwittingly the secular Cadet movement has imperilled institutional religion by encroaching upon the usual hours of church services for drill and training. The C.L.B. asserts that training can be given even better during weekdays, and the War Office itself supports the claim in saying that the C.L.B. is the best-equipped and best-instructed body of Cadets in the Kingdom. In the present era of reconstruction the C.L.B. claims to introduce into the lives of the lads who have left the elementary school the principle of voluntary discipline based upon religion, and the secular corps cannot make the same claim.

The C.L.B. has the further claim upon the Church's support that the incumbent can ensure that his officers are all men of strong moral and spiritual character. Another excellent work amongst boys which has proved its worth is the Scout movement. I am glad to see from the returns that there are 118 troops at work in our parishes. It has often been my privilege at parochial functions to review a guard of honour composed of Scouts or Wolf-cubs, and a troop is a valuable asset to the corporate life of a parish, as well as a direct avenue of religious influence into boy life when run upon

right lines. For the Scout Law is based upon the principles of Christ.

There was a general expression of opinion that war conditions had very considerably disorganized Church work among boys, and that a good deal of leakage in membership of societies has followed from the increasing lack of control over the boys during the absence of their fathers at the war.

Girls' Organizations.—Closely allied with the work of the C.L.B. and Scouts is that of the Girl Guides, which has grown rapidly in numbers and efficiency, and I warmly commend their excellent work to the study of all incumbents. But this does not affect the work so well done by the G.F.S., which should receive the active co-operation of all interested in girl welfare.

But whatever the organization, care must be taken lest it becomes in itself the end instead of a means to the end. Sir Robertson Nicoll said truly, "The Church should possess a soup kitchen, but should not be turned into a soup kitchen." The Club, the C.L.B., the Scouts, must all be stepping-stones to the Church, and so the recreation found within them must all tend to make the lad better equipped for the serious and responsible side of life. If the lad can realize that the end of the football match on Saturday should make him more fit for worship on the Sunday and for work on the Monday, then he will have learned a lesson which will help him throughout his life to put the various parts of his life in their true perspective and all centred

around his Lord, Whom he will find in all of them.

Problems Resulting from Distorted Truth.—Among these may be classed Spiritualism and Christian Science. At the moment I do not intend to attempt to deal at length with either of these important questions. But I strongly advise that when dealt with they should be dealt with seriously and after mature consideration based upon adequate study. To act otherwise is apt to strengthen the position of the advocates of both. These movements have reached their present position largely because they both contain an element of truth which has largely been ignored by Christian teachers. Spiritualism has thriven upon the neglect of the doctrine contained in the belief of "the communion of Saints" and Christian Science holds her position largely because the Church has forgotten that "the prayer of faith shall save the sick." Both these important questions will be discussed at the Lambeth Conference, and I strongly advise that both should be carefully studied both from what are commonly known as the Orthodox and Unorthodox points of view.

Intellectual Problems.—Everything points to a higher average of the intellectual equipment of the nation. The Labour Party are alert as to its importance. The Workers' Educational Association is an evidence of this. The classes conducted by Oxford graduates among the miners of South Wales is further evidence of this fact, and the Church must

watch closely the effect which such movements will have upon her life and work. The priest of the future will find in his congregation a different type of man to that which his predecessor of fifty years ago had, and while the spiritual qualification is, as ever, the essential qualification for the ministry, yet it must possess side by side with it intellectual power and outlook. Hence the training for the ministry must be more thorough than in the past. It must not be rushed in order that a man may get to work. It must be prolonged and become more practical. The Church must undertake the task of training men for the ministry. No man called of God must be unable to obey the call from lack of means, but no man must be admitted into the ministry without adequate training. The question of a permanent diaconate is now being discussed. Much can be said in its favour, but the difficulties connected with it are very real and demand serious consideration before the diaconate can be recognized as a normal method of the ministry of to-day. But important as is the training before admission to the ministry, it is equally important that the intellectual equipment should be increased after Ordination whether as deacons or as priests.

(*a*) *As Deacons.*—One of the greatest difficulties of my Episcopate has been connected with the examination for priests' orders. Man after man who has rendered excellent service and has striven loyally to carry out the directions of his vicar, has failed ignominiously in his priest's examination, and

I have had to admit either an unfit man into the ministry, or else to cause him lifelong chagrin and disappointment by being compelled to extend his diaconate. When I have inquired into the cause of his failure I have found that frequently he has been used as largely and as widely in the work of the parish as his brother curate who was in priests' orders, with the exception, of course, that he has not been called upon to celebrate. This ought not to be. There should be a marked difference between the work of the curate in priests' orders and one who is still a deacon. I have not hitherto laid down any regulations with regard to the number of sermons that a deacon ought to be expected to preach, but I fear I shall have to do so shortly in the interest of the ministry, unless incumbents lessen the number of sermons expected from a deacon. Over and over again have I found deacons preaching seventy or eighty times during their diaconate. This is bad for the man, who is absolutely untrained, who is compelled to form habits of hasty preparation and of preaching ill-digested matter hurriedly put together. It is unfair to the congregations and is to be condemned in every respect. I do not think that a deacon ought to preach more than once each Sunday, but less on the average, unless there are extraordinary and exceptional reasons for his doing so. The incumbent is also expected to watch over his reading; to know exactly what his subjects for examination are, and to inquire from the deacon from time to time as to which books he has mastered

and how he is proceeding with regard to his work. Over and over again I have found incumbents who had never even taken the trouble to ask their deacons what the subjects were which were required for the priests' examination. The deacon cannot be expected to prepare adequately for the most important examination in his life, for that is what the priests' examination really is, unless he is liberated from the anxieties and worries which continually haunt a man who has excessive duties to perform. Again the devotional side of a deacon's life should be carefully watched, and, if possible, he should be allowed to communicate on certain occasions without having to officially take part in the celebration. In other words the whole attitude of the incumbent to the deacon should be governed by the fact that he is simply a man in *training* for Holy Orders and not a man fully ordained to the priesthood. If this course is followed a man at the commencement of his ministry forms habits which are of the greatest service to him.

(*b*) *As Priests.*—The Apostolic injunction is as binding to-day as it was when uttered by the great Apostle to Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 13–15). "Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine; meditate on these things; give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear unto all." This applies equally to the priest of forty years' standing as it does to the priest of one year. At his Ordination he is asked, "Will you be diligent in reading of the Holy Scriptures and in such studies

as help to the knowledge of the same ? " and he answers that he will. Is he diligent ? Does not the teaching from the pulpit frequently do little to *convince* men of error, or to confirm them in their faith or to build them up in the solid foundation of Christian doctrine and practice, and is not the reason found in the fact that the preacher himself has not given " attention to reading " and to " doctrine " ? This lack frequently prevents the clergy in the large town areas from exercising that influence which they ought to possess as the recognized teachers of Christianity and as the guide to the nation as to the application of Christian principles in everyday life. The clergy in the country area, with numerous and honourable exceptions, are apt to view their responsibility lightly because their congregations are small and mainly consist of the poor, and hence succumb to the temptation to prepare hurriedly and without any serious effort. It is, therefore, of paramount importance that clergy, in forming plans for their work, should definitely allot a certain part of their day to reading and study. The growing calls on a minister's time make this more and more difficult, but Gladstone when Premier endeavoured to read Butler and Homer each year. The study of Hooker, Butler, Jewel, Cranmer, Jeremy Taylor, Waterland, to mention no modern writers, will tend to make the brain stronger, and the effect will certainly be felt by the congregation whose priest is a " reading " man. If possible, each priest should belong to one of the great standing libraries and in this way keep in

touch with the best of current thought, and he will find membership with the Society of Sacred Study a real help, and Canon Rendall, its secretary, will gladly advise any priest as to his reading, if desired to do so.

While emphasizing the importance of the intellectual equipment being maintained at a high level I must at the same time warn clergy and laity alike from blindly accepting much which is put forth in the name of "scholarship." For the man who is in honest doubt we have the greatest sympathy, and for the honest searcher after truth every encouragement, but the position of the ordinary lay member of the Church is very different from that of the priest. The former can make statements concerning doctrines which many would deplore and deny, and yet such would not necessarily render his position as a loyal member of the Church insecure, but in the case of the priest the position is very different. He is accredited by the Church as *her* teacher and representative, on his definite acceptance of great historical facts as stated in her Creed. He is to teach the candidates for Confirmation the meaning of the Creed, and to unfold and apply its teaching in his sermons, and he does so *as a priest* in the Church of God licensed thereto by her Bishops. It is, therefore, surely right that if, while the Church encourages him in his studies and urges him to seek after truth, he is led to different conclusions as to the faith than those which his Church clearly holds, he should at once reconsider his position. Since the Reformation the Church of England has been the

home of sound learning, even the candidates for Confirmation must "learn the Creed," "hear sermons," and, therefore, there must be a ready welcome to every student, and sympathy, deep and real, for any man, whether priest or layman, who may find himself in a maze of uncertainty and of Agnosticism. In all such cases the Lord's teaching must be applied, and we must not break the bruised reed or quench the smoking flax, and yet it is well that students during such a period should exercise a sane restraint. In the interest of the continued faith of men whose reading has been scanty and whose brain power is weak, there must be no hasty rushing into print or proclaiming that which rests largely upon theories and opinions unsupported frequently by any solid evidence. We must remember that for every scholar there are a thousand ordinary men to be considered. The undigested learning of the scholar, when administered to the working-man, often produces doubt concerning all revealed truth and in the end apathy and spiritual decay. If some of our scholars would try and realize the effect likely to be produced on uneducated minds by that which they put forth, they would surely pause before spreading spiritual doubt and unrest in the minds of men. Scholars should remember the parochial clergy, whose task they frequently make most difficult. In the middle of the last century, for instance, the teaching current among a certain type of scholars and asserted with a dogmatism which almost scoffed at any expression of denial and of

doubt, affirmed that only some four of the Pauline Epistles could be regarded as genuine and that the Acts were simply a late effort to reconcile the Pauline and Petrine conceptions of Christianity. These views to-day are largely discarded. No doubt those who upheld them were scholarly and genuine, and it may be said that the discussion upon them and consequent research has strengthened in the end the claim of the Epistles to Pauline authorship and authority, but in recalling the controversies of that period in the light of to-day it is clear that much, then written, ought never to have been written with the dogmatism with which it was put forth. Throughout England to-day conversions—and I do not use the word merely in a sentimental sense—are needed if England is to be saved from greed and self. There is a dearth of such. The proclamation of a non-miraculous Christianity or anything approaching it does not produce the greatest of all miracles, the new birth, and so does not enable men either to see or to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. Yet it was for this purpose that the Apostles were sent forth and the Church received her commission. The faith once delivered to the saints was not surely composed of myth or of stories without any foundation. On the contrary, as is stated in the report of the Lambeth Conference of 1908, " the historical facts stated in the Creeds are an essential part of the faith of the Church." The priest sent to teach this is surely not expected to explain away the facts by, for instance, interpreting

the clauses " conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary " as simply meaning that He was born according to the ordinary laws of nature, but under circumstances of unusual purity. Words must and ought to be taken to mean what they are generally understood to mean, and the clause in the Creed to which I have referred and that relating to our Lord's resurrection are interpreted and used over and over again in the Articles and Prayer Book, which fix as clearly as possible the meaning which the Church attaches to them, which surely is that she orders their use believing that they record " historical facts." All down the ages from the very beginning, the critical mind has assailed the Creed, and yet, as Mr. Gladstone emphasized, it stands secure on the impregnable rock of Holy Scripture. The subject is one of great difficulty. The student must pursue his way wherever truth seems to lead him, but the teacher sent forth by the Church should, *while he remains her representative,* teach that which she, in her corporate capacity, has received and ordained him to proclaim.

Problems of Urgent Importance.—Of these I will name two, reunion, and the position and work of women within the Church.

(*a*) *Reunion.*—Our Blessed Lord's prayer, " That they all may be one : as thou Father art in me and I in thee," is still unanswered. The Church, His Body, is rent by division and strife. During the late war England was the ally of Russia and of Belgium, but England's Church is separated by a gulf deep

and wide from the Church in both. The divisions of Christendom have, during the ages, weakened her spiritual and moral power. The Church has become powerless to fulfil and even careless of her mission, her influence for good has been lessened and has actually become a power for evil in the world. Her internal jealousies have promoted wars and cruelties, of which the Inquisition with its iniquities is a striking sample, and her character, aims and methods have frequently departed from the standard set by her Lord and her Apostolic founders. We look at Rome, and while we thank God for the Christlike lives lived by many who own her sway, we realize how her system has produced down the ages a state of life in the Vatican and of corruption in her councils, the equal of which is difficult to find in the annals of the history of any State during the same period. Among her Popes have shone some of the most illustrious lives of devotion to God, but, alas! the history of the Papacy as a whole is one over which we would gladly draw a veil. A system of such a nature is one we cannot accept, coupled as it is with its arrogant claim to the exclusive right to the use of the word "Catholic," and yet no Church in Christendom has more flagrantly departed from Catholic doctrine and practice. We can only pray that God in His mercy will, by the Holy Spirit, cleanse that great Church and restore to her purity of doctrine and order, and in this way pave the way for reunion with ourselves.

The relation of the Eastern Church to ourselves

is of a more friendly nature, and she has given many tokens of her desire for a closer connexion with the English Church. There are differences—important differences—between them and us, but unlike Rome, the Orthodox Church has and does show a great desire and readiness to encourage and promote the circulation of the Holy Scriptures among the people in their own tongue. This arises largely from the great position the Bible occupies in the teaching and life of that Church. The English Church bases her teaching on that of the Book. The Primate has lately appointed a committee of investigation concerning the Orthodox Church, and it is hoped that as a result of their labours a real advance may be made towards closer co-operation leading ultimately to a living unity.

Reunion with Nonconformists.—As will be seen, I am not unmindful of the dire results of our separation from the Churches of Rome and of the East. Yet neither of them stands exactly on the same plane as our Nonconformist brethren. They and their fathers are of our kith and kin. Their sons and ours fought in the same trenches and many of them fell together, to rise together to meet their common Lord. They and their fathers owe all their spiritual knowledge to us, as representing the Mother Church of this country. They are in a special sense the spiritual children of the old Church. We dare not, we cannot be indifferent to them. On our bookshelves are found books by them full of learning, of devotion and of spiritual insight, which enrich the thoughts and

spiritual lives of both ourselves and our people. Oh what strength the Church would possess if only English Christians could speak with one great united voice. Is it not our bounden duty before God to spare no pains, to begrudge no labour, to refuse no sacrifice, if only this great result can be achieved? How dare we talk of the sin of schism with such a record of apathy, negligence, lack of tact, and fair dealing behind us in our own midst. "Woe," said our Lord, "be to them from whom the offence cometh." Lord Halifax at the annual meeting of the E.C.U. well said: "Can any portion of Christendom close its eyes to the duty of repentance for the past, of making amendment for that past, as may be possible, or afford not to show the utmost charity and forbearance in regard to those from whom it may find itself in separation *largely* by its own *fault*?" Again, says Lord Halifax: "Can we pretend, if we look at our own local history, that the rulers of the Church of England are not largely responsible for the birth and present existence of Dissent?" This we must bear in mind when dealing with this problem. I do not advocate a mere "federation of Churches." That is, in my opinion, unworkable and undesirable. Organic union must be our aim, I must speak with reserve, but although I realize the immense difficulties to be overcome I am full of hope. Events are moving rapidly, more rapidly than many may imagine. We must each pray that this movement may not be wrecked by the great enemy of the Church. May I ask each Rural Dean to consider

whether in his deanery there cannot be carried into effect the recommendation of the Lambeth Conference, viz., " That private meetings of ministers and laymen of our own and other Churches should frequently be held, in which, by common study of the Word of God, by frank and friendly discussion and by united prayer, they could at once realize and deepen the sense of union in the fellowship of Christ " —also that they " should arrange conferences with representatives of different bodies and meetings for united acknowledgment of the sin of division and intercession for the growth of unity." I shall be glad to hear that such gatherings are being held.

Beyond all I long for the day when the rank and file of both the Church and of Nonconformity will hear the story of the Cross from the lips of those to whom it means everything. I am not here advocating what is commonly known as the " interchange of pulpits." Remembering the use to which our Churches were put in bygone days, I feel that there is much to be said in favour of Nonconformist ministers speaking at services other than the regular services of the Church. It seems, for instance, out of keeping with the spirit of love which is to reveal our discipleship to the world that, on such occasions as the arrival of peace there should have been objections to united gatherings for thanksgiving unless they were held in a theatre, or cinema, or hall. Would there have been anything incongruous, anything disloyal to our Lord or the Church which He founded, if on so great an occasion, Church

people and Nonconformists had gathered together in the naves of our Cathedrals and churches, and both alike out of a full heart spoke concerning the blessings vouchsafed to them?

It is needless to add how I long with all my heart for reunion, and how I repudiate with all my power any expressions which are used, which seem to depreciate the mighty working of the Holy Spirit among our Nonconformist brethren. I want the steps to reunion to be taken in an orderly and constitutional manner, and while the question is before the Bishops and until the opinion of the Lambeth Conference has been expressed I deprecate any action in the direction I have indicated.

I cannot close the subject without emphasizing the need for reunion among ourselves. We glory, and rightly so, in the comprehensive character of the English Church, but in recent days comprehensiveness has meant greater division and strife within our own borders. The lives of Tait, Benson and Creighton deal largely with this aspect of the history of the last fifty years. The unhappy division among ourselves weakens our appeal to those outside our borders to sink their differences and rejoin us. Every Churchman should seek to lessen and not widen the gulf which exists between himself and his fellow-Churchmen. When reunion is reached with Rome, with the Orthodox Church, with our Nonconformists friends, it will not be because we have or have not worn or done this or that in some particular manner. Reunion will

result from something greater than trivial acts of ritual or of order, and the man who allows his policy to be shaped on lines which he thinks may effect reunion has not grasped how great the gulf of division is or that it can only be bridged by a great outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, we shall do well to remember that our Lord's way to reunion must be ours. There must be no forbidding the men who cast out devils because they follow not us ; no calling down of fire on such to consume them ; but prayer, constant and sincere, that we all may be one, and this because we have caught the spirit of the head of the Church, whether in Russia, Rome, or Canterbury, and we must learn to love those who love our common Lord, so that men may realize that we are His disciples. When that day dawns reunion draweth nigh.

The Church and Women.—It is apparent that the great change, intensified by the war, in the status, life and work of women seen on every side must inevitably affect her relationship with the Church. Hitherto we have accepted almost mechanically the idea that woman is naturally religious and that therefore no gulf will exist between her and the Church. I fear that, however, unless we give careful consideration to the whole position of woman and her relationship with the Church, we must not be surprised if, within a very short time, we find the two separated widely, with a gulf between as deep as that which exists between Labour and the Church. Some time ago a strong

committee which I appointed to consider the question of women's work in the Diocese reported in favour of the formation of a Diocesan Board for the development of work among women. We have been fortunate to secure the services of Miss Oakeshott, the secretary and organizer of the movement. It should be understood that the purpose for which Miss Oakeshott has been appointed secretary to the Board is not merely to provide an additional speaker to women's and girls' organizations in the Diocese, but rather to co-ordinate the work already in existence and to strengthen it in every department, while at the same time opening out and developing new spheres of useful service for women. This will include the training of workers, their adequate remuneration, and pensions when incapacitated by age or ill-health. The Board will not supersede existing organizations, such as the Mothers' Union, which is doing such excellent work in the Diocese, but rather it will strengthen them. We anticipate much from the Board's operation, dealing as it will with every phase of women's work viewed both from a social, industrial and religious standpoint. Doubtless you will expect me to address you on the larger and wider question of the place of women in the life and work of the Church. First let me state clearly that I am not prepared to admit the claim of women to the priesthood. Even if I thought that such a position was open on Scriptural and Catholic grounds, which I do not, I should still oppose such an innovation on the grounds of expe-

diency. The position of deaconess is on a very different footing, and I am fully prepared to ordain women as deaconesses under certain conditions for certain clearly defined functions. But the number of women so ordained will be very few, and therefore I have been asked whether there is any definite principle upon which the sphere of women in the Church can be determined. In my opinion the solution of the difficulty can be found only by the frank acceptance of the fact that there is no objection in principle to the admission of women to any of the functions to which laymen are admitted in the Church, and that there are no legal restrictions upon the services of laywomen other than those which apply to laymen.

This proposition possibly may be opposed from the standpoint of Scripture and of Church tradition, of sex and the effect which such a proposal might have upon reunion.

First. It may be argued that such a proposition is not in conformity with, but rather is opposed to, the teaching of the New Testament. It may be shown that Christ dedicated His ministry only to men, and that our Lord never was known to commit any definite commission to women. I admit the strength of such a contention, but if our Lord's teaching is examined as a whole, I venture to think that there is not a sentence of His which by any kind of implication could be thought to oppose the statement that in His Church the position of women was equal to that of laymen. On this question

St. Paul's teaching is quoted, especially his statements, "let your women keep silence" (1 Cor. xiv. 13) and "every man praying or prophesying having his head covered dishonoureth his head and every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head." On this question let me quote some words by a distinguished scholar and High Churchman, Canon Mason, of Canterbury. He said: "Prophets and prophetesses alike were both to prophesy and pray aloud in the assembly, but the prophetess was not to forget she was a woman and behave as a man. She was to cover her head while she made her voice heard. When later he bids women keep silent, it is unnatural to suppose he withdrew a permission so recently acknowledged. The simplest interpretation is that he will not allow prophetesses to rise to utter a revelation received while another prophet was speaking. That was not consistent with the position of women." There are other interpretations of the passage quoted, but Canon Mason's opinion is held by others of equal eminence who give the same interpretation as he does. Surely St. Paul's teaching in Corinthians must be viewed in the light of that to the Galatians (Gal. iii.), "that there is neither male nor female, but ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Bishop Lightfoot's paraphrase on this text is worth quoting: "In Christ ye are all saints, every barrier is swept away. No special claims, disabilities respecting sex exist, for in Him none can exist. The conventional distinctions of

religious caste or of social rank, even the natural distinction of sex are banished hence, one heart beats in all, one mind guides all, one life is led by all, ye are all one man, ye are members of Christ." Ramsay, commenting on the same passage and contrasting it with that quoted from Corinthians, says that the real reason for the difference is to be found that in Antioch and Iconium the position of women was one unusually high and important, and that they were often entrusted with offices and duties which elsewhere were denied them. Hence the allusion to the equality of the sexes, and the perfect form which the Church must ultimately attain would not seem to the people of Galatia to be so entirely revolutionary. Holy Scripture must be regarded as the supreme authority on this and on all questions of faith and order, but the teaching of St. Paul must be read and interpreted in the light of the New Testament as a whole, and I believe that his statement in Corinthians must be governed by the one in Galatians, which is borne out by the teaching of the rest of the New Testament, and that his words to the Corinthians were not to be taken as having universal application for all time, but were only used owing to the peculiar position of women in a city like Corinth at that time.

Secondly. With regard to the custom of the Church. Church history makes it clear that, down the ages, two forces were at work, one seeking to utilize the services of women, to extend those services,

to recognize them ; the other, tending to put women on one side, to keep them completely in the background and accord them no real voice in the management or government of the Church. It was not surprising that the latter of the two forces gained the upper hand when it is realized that women throughout Europe had no political status, that the Church, represented by the Church of Rome, gradually became more and more political and more powerful, and was inclined to rely upon the male population, who really governed the situation.

Thirdly. It may be argued that women are incapable of exercising the same functions in the Church as laymen owing to their sex. But surely a great change is coming over the attitude of the public mind towards the position of men and women. This change of attitude had grown and expanded during the war in every direction, and when we contemplate the work which laymen or women can do in the Church, is there anything in that work incongruous with the life of a true woman of God ? Would it unsex a woman to be put upon an equality with a layman in the Church of Christ ?

Fourthly. It may be objected that any attempt to do as I suggest would retard reunion with the great Churches on the Continent. Can any one prophesy as to what grave changes are likely to take place within the Orthodox Church within the next few years ? I think the political situation is

bound to affect her in a way which no one can even imagine. If we look at the great Roman Church, have we not to ask ourselves, "When reunion comes, on what terms will it be made?" I cannot imagine any loyal Churchman who would wish it to be on the terms of the character of the Roman Church previous to the Reformation or as she is to-day. If ever reunion comes, it will result from a different kind of Christendom in Europe from that of to-day. It will not be a Christendom as represented by the Orthodox Church, or by the Roman Church, or even by our own. I think that when the time arrives for reunion, there will have been a vast change over the whole situation, that a question such as this will loom very small, and seem very petty in the light of the great reunion then contemplated. I do not think that any question such as this will ever for a moment retard reunion when the time arrives for such a glorious event.

Equality between the sexes in the Church of God so far as layfolk are concerned is the logical action that can be taken in view of what has already been permitted and sanctioned in the Church. Things have already gone either too far or not far enough. Take the Pilgrimage of Prayer. Did their work differ very much from what our Lord sent the Seventy to do in the villages of Palestine? We have already allowed women to take their part and place in the newly constituted Councils of the Church. Their full recognition was inevitable. Women had already been allowed to address the

Church in various ways, although not technically inside the walls of a consecrated building. When in Bethnal Green, I held a Women's Service on Monday nights in the church, and I was anxious that Mrs. Paget, wife of the Bishop of Stepney, should address it. I had to ask her to give the address in a large hall, which involved the trouble of moving 800 or 900 chairs. My churchwarden said to me after the meeting, " Why could not Mrs. Paget have spoken in church ? " It seemed to him that if she could address the women connected with the Church in a large hall she might be allowed to do so inside the walls of that building which they designated as a church. I do not think that a woman speaking within a consecrated building under the same conditions as a layman is so contrary to the traditions of the past as some imagine. In the Roman Communion in days gone by, and even at present, women have been allowed in certain circumstances to take part in some services of the Church. Although it was quite true that such acts were not done in Parish Churches, women have been allowed to speak and conduct services in the chapels in the presence of priests who might be looked upon as the persons to have performed such services. Therefore I think that the principle had been sanctioned in days gone by under authority. But I am not prepared to say that I am ready to sanction women doing everything in a church which laymen can do. There is a vast difference between the assertion of a principle and its universal application.

There is to-day, as at Corinth, the question of expediency. The great Apostle said: "All things are lawful to me, but all things are not expedient." For instance, on the ground of expediency I should never dream of sanctioning a woman to be a "server," just as St. Paul in his day refused to allow women to speak because it was not expedient. To-day some of the most saintly and devoted, yet retiring women in the Church realize that they are not using the gifts with which God Himself has endowed them, and they are asking how long they are to go on in their own communion not occupying the position to which they believe God has called them. The Church must not lose the opportunity of encouraging spiritual and intellectual women to use all the gifts God had given them. The Church of England has so often lost its opportunity; it lost it in the days of Wesley, it lost it in the days of Darwin, it has lost it very largely with Labour when if only the Church had been wise she might have won Labour to her side at the end of the last century. The life of Shaftesbury reveals how in his struggles against the abominable conditions of labour in mine and factory—conditions degrading to manhood, frequently disgusting with regard to womanhood and contrary to every principle of Christ concerning children; he could not enlist the great body of clergy or Church people's sympathy. The lives of Maurice, Stanley and Kingsley tell the same story of apathy and neglect, and in many instances even of active hostility, regarding any

effort to improve the conditions of life in great industrial centres. Joseph Arch complained of similar treatment when engaged in his campaign to improve the lot of the agricultural labourer.

I do not want the Church to make another mistake. All these considerations lead me to hope that the Church will wisely consider the whole question. It is important, however, that whatever is done should be done by authority. Personally, whatever my own views are, I cannot see my way to allow, on my own authority only, any woman to speak in church on the same lines as a licensed Reader. A change so great in our procedure should only be made by Convocation, therefore I cannot allow, until the matter has been determined by that body, any woman to speak either at an ordinary service or to a mixed congregation within a consecrated building. I believe, however, it is within my power to allow a woman to speak, if requested to do so by an incumbent, in the church to a gathering entirely composed of women or young children, provided that she is a churchwoman and that she simply speaks as a woman to women. I believe that God is in the midst of what is called the Women's Movement. Wild claims and grave mistakes have been made. This was inevitable, but it behoves the Church to listen, if perchance God is speaking to her. Is it not possible that, in her own ministry and perhaps quite distinct in kind from that of the priesthood, God may intend women to work out

His sovereign will for the birth of a new and righteous world, even as He selected the one who was highly favoured among women to be the mother of One who was the Saviour of the world and her own?

At some length I have brought before you some of the problems awaiting solution. If they are not solved by the Cross and all that it means, they will remain unsolved. There and there only could Bunyan's Pilgrim cast off his load, and so to-day the world can never rid itself of its load of social, moral and intellectual burdens at any other spot, and so, we, who are meant to be the teachers and healers of the world, must, like the great Apostle, know nothing among men save Jesus and Him crucified. The Cross is the only and the all-sufficient remedy for the whole world. May the Holy Spirit help us to realize more fully within ourselves the fruits of our redemption, through it and by our witness of word and life reveal it unto men.

CHAPTER V

THE CHURCH AND HER MISSION

THE subject to which I now draw your attention is of paramount importance. It deals with the main objective of the Church and with the reason why we ask all who profess to be the disciples of our Lord to join His organized body. Surely it is not that in her communion they may derive benefit personally, but rather that by connexion with her they may be able to carry out more fully the Lord's will and enable that will to be more universally obeyed and thus to establish His kingdom. This is surely the objective of the Church, but alas! how rarely is it realized by her members. The teaching of the Church on this question is clear. The child at baptism is not admitted into "the congregation" that he may receive good or benefit thereby, but that he may "confess the faith," "fight under His banner," and "continue to be Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto his life's end." If this aspect of Church membership was taught how different would be the character of the Church and her relationship to the world. The vast majority of Church people have no concep-

tion of their responsibility for the conversion of the world. They receive the " Body " broken and partake of the " Blood " shed, but rarely with any idea that it was broken or shed for the whole world and that they, partaking of it, must be partakers, with Christ, in the conquest of the world. The end of Church membership to thousands is practically that of receiving the Holy Communion. Such never grasp that they eat that they may not only live, but make disciples. Their conception of Church work is narrow and limited. In their opinion it is confined to acting as warden or sidesman, to singing in the choir, or teaching in the Sunday School, and they seldom realize their serious responsibility as a witness. The command, " Ye shall be witnesses unto me," has no practical application to them, and they never venture to say to brother or neighbour or fellow-workman, " We have found the Christ " or attempt to bring them to Jesus. The failure to make Church membership mean, in thousands of cases, little besides attendance at the services of the Church and subscribing to Church funds is largely due to the undue emphasis laid upon these things. For every invitation or exhortation to " witness " for Christ, there are a score urging attendance at church and the Holy Communion. The result is seen in the appalling apathy concerning either missions overseas or home evangelization. It would be instructive if we could obtain some idea as to how many communicants out of the 74,868 who communicated on Easter Day

take in and read any missionary publication or subscribe to a missionary society; or have read or heard of the Report of the Archbishops' Evangelistic Committee; or are responsible for any work in their own parishes. The percentage would be lamentably small, and this result should cause every priest to consider whether his teaching is not out of perspective and whether his people are not so much concerned with "eating" and "drinking" and "worshipping" that they have no time and no inclination to witness or to evangelize. The call to personal service must be made, repeated and again repeated, if the Church is to advance. The day is passing rapidly when men or women will come to church simply because it is a Sunday habit to do so. The numbers in our Sunday Schools are decreasing by hundreds of thousands, and if the members of our Church do not cease their spiritual selfishness and leave their guilds and many services and meetings and band themselves into an army of witnesses and of aggression, then indeed she will fail in her purpose and mission. The distinction between home and foreign work must cease. The Church is one, whether in Korea, Uganda, India or England, and the common burden must be borne by the whole body. Men must realize the call of the Church as men realized the call of country in 1914. The record of 1913 must become an object of shame and of repentance. In that year the whole of Christian England, including Church and Nonconformist effort, raised for

work overseas a sum which would only have kept the British army in the field for six hours during the war. The Church, without its Roll of Honour of the names of men who have gone into the Mission field, must feel as disgraced as, in the early days of the war, a village or town felt whose sons were playing the coward's part and remaining at home when duty called elsewhere. The whole Church, rich and poor, old and young, must be organized as "marching unto war." Lay work must be developed. At the moment I cannot deal with the question of the permanent diaconate. The subject is beset both with great possibilities and great difficulties, and must be discussed elsewhere, but the position of Diocesan and Parochial Lay-reader is one affording opportunities for useful service.

LAY-READERS.—The exigencies of war conditions, and the consequent shortage of ordained clergy during the absence of many at the front, gave the opportunity to the Reader to vindicate his worth in parochial life. The new conditions have shown that a body of men, the functions of whose office are those which the Church from primitive times has considered the prerogative of the qualified laity, can exercise a well-defined and regulated ministry in the Church by supplementing the work of the ordained clergy and freeing them for those higher ministries which belong to the priesthood alone.

At the same time the new conditions have not only emphasized the need of such an office, but

have shown the necessity that it should be held only by a well-equipped and qualified body of men with credentials guaranteed by a Central Diocesan Board and working under its intimate knowledge and supervision.

There is but one " office "—that of Reader : the duties attached to it depend on the nature of the licence or commission given by the Bishop to those who are admitted into it. Furthermore, it is not an order in the Church, but an office in this particular Diocese, and therefore a man admitted as a Reader in one Diocese is not thereby constituted a Reader in any other.

There are three classes of Readers in this Diocese, and their specific duties and limitations are clearly defined in the licence issued to each. At this present time there are fourteen Diocesan Readers whose sphere of work extends throughout the Diocese.

The commission is held permanently, subject to annual endorsement. Ninety-eight men in the Diocese, licensed to a particular parish, at which alone he may assist in the services in the church. In the case of men who are secretaries of a Church society, a clause is sometimes added permitting them to give addresses in connexion with their society in the deanery or Diocese. The terms of this commission do not permit the holder to give addresses in consecrated buildings.

While I recognize the excellent work done by the Readers I desire incumbents and the Readers

themselves to realize that their sphere of work is clearly defined and that they cannot serve in the regular services of the Church excepting on the conditions and in the manner prescribed in their licences. The observance of this rule will prevent friction, and in the end will further and strengthen the position of lay work in the Diocese.

EVANGELISTIC WORK.—Roughly, Evangelistic work may be divided between that which is done inside the consecrated building and that which is done outside. The former is largely in the hands of the clergy, and the latter should be mainly the work of the laity led by the incumbent.

The old question is ever presenting itself, "Why do not men attend Church?" The answer is ever the same. They do not attend because they have no desire to bring their lives into conformity with the ideals for which the Church stands or because, when they do attend church, the services are such as do not appeal to them or help them in their daily lives. The first reason shows the necessity for wise and aggressive Evangelistic work in the parish, and the second necessitates sincere inquiry as to how best to adopt and conduct the services within the Church that they may satisfy more successfully the needs of men.

(*a*) *Evangelistic Services.*—These need not, of necessity, exclude the ordinary services of the Church, but the services, if they are to be successful, must be simple, homely and congregational. The priest must be clear and audible. The parsonic

and sanctimonious voice must give place to a manly tone, for surely God is more honoured in worship by the natural rather than the affected voice. The music must not be left to the choirmaster or to the choir. The compilers of the Prayer Book meant the *Te Deum*, the Psalms, the Canticles to be sung *by the congregation* and not merely by the choir. No tune ought to be selected which the congregation cannot easily follow. The only time in any service, either of Holy Communion or of Morning or Evening Prayer, when it is in accordance with true Church ideals for the choir only to sing is when an anthem is sung in the place appointed. Clergy frequently allow tunes to be selected which make it impossible for the congregation to worship, yet worship by the choir is no substitute for worship by the congregation. I plead for the restoration of the opportunity of worship by the congregation. The Evening Service should be of the simplest nature. The question of incense is not now before us, but whatever view may be held as to its legitimacy, I earnestly hope that clergy and communicants will have such a love for souls that they will cease its use in any service in the evening. It is certain that the ordinary Englishman does not appreciate it. The Evening Service more than any other service is that which persons attend who have "lapsed" from Communion or lost touch with the Church and her life and work. Special care should be taken to avoid the introduction of any use which is likely to irritate or disturb such people. "The bruised reed

must not be broken." *If* they are weak brethren, then the strong, that is the incense users, should bear the infirmities of the weak. The Evening Service, more than ever, must be protected from undue and unnecessary ritual and made, as far as possible, a service for the man in the street. From such a service the road should be made easy to Confirmation and Communion. But important as the service is, the sermon is equally so. Clergy frequently forget that they were ordained to the ministry of the Word as well as that of the Sacraments. Study as to the position which preaching or the proclaiming of the "Word" occupies in the New Testament and in the Ordinal would reveal to men how utterly misleading is the assertion often made that men should come to church to worship and not to hear sermons. Christ was the greatest of all preachers. The Apostles went everywhere preaching and teaching. They asserted that "faith comes by hearing" and they exhorted the people to hear. The sermon must be taken seriously, but the preacher must remember he is, first and foremost, an Evangelist—a bearer of good news. He must preach "Christ crucified." It is one thing to preach salvation by Christ: it is another to preach Christ as the Saviour. Hearts are more surely to be won by showing them Jesus crucified than by any other means. A Christ without a Cross is a King without a throne. We want to get back to the simple elementary truths which sometimes we are tempted to think too simple

and elementary for these days, but they contain the only gospel which can save and regenerate. If you, my brethren of the clergy, really want to save souls you must grasp and use the only instrument which can save. " This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners," and the force of that statement will not be lessened if you add " of whom I am chief." As the great preacher, Alexander Maclaren, says : " The true preacher ever brings his doctrines to bear on the emotions, then on the will and then on practice." The preacher is also the teacher, but he has to take care that in his most advanced instruction he never leaves the initial truths behind. He only unfolds them more fully. The teacher's subject matter is the same as the Evangelist's. The beginning, the centre, the end of the message of the Evangelist is Christ, his Incarnation, Crucifixion, Resurrection, Ascension. The Christian teacher has no other theme. It is the same. The textbook for both is the Bible. The preacher who leaves Christ out of his sermon degrades his office and betrays his trust. If Christ be presented fully and clearly, men will listen. I say reverently that the best advertisement any church can possess is obtained when it becomes known as the church in which Christ is preached. May this be the character of every church in the Diocese.

Our churches may be used for other services than those ordered. Services for men and services for

women should be held, but all such services must have the approval and sanction of the Bishop before being held. They should be of a less formal nature than the ordinary service and yet possess no characteristics out of harmony with them. This leads me to consider :—

(1) *Work among Men.*—This should be largely the task of the male communicants led by the members of the C.E.M.S. In some parishes the C.E.M.S. is an active force, but in others the society exists merely on paper. I trust that the formation of a Diocesan branch which is contemplated in the autumn may result in its increased efficiency. The communicants should throw themselves into the work of visitation of men, of public-houses, of allotments and of places wherever men are found. The hopes concerning a great mission among men after their return from the Army have not been realized. From the returns made to me during the Visitation I gather that as regards Church life the war on the whole has made no deep impression, but such as it has is unfavourable, although it is admitted that during this period of reaction it is difficult to state definitely what the ultimate and permanent effect will be. There appears to be no active hostility to the Church, but indifference, coupled with an altered attitude towards the clergy where the men have known a capable and friendly padre. On the whole, however, the clergy have found men more accessible and more willing to discuss religious matters. This presents an oppor-

tunity for Churchmen, especially those who have returned from the Front, of endeavouring to get into close contact with the men, and for this purpose it is advisable that the Parochial Church Council should carefully organize such visitation of men, such conferences on social and religious matters as shall be likely to bring the men of the parish together. The excellent work done in C.A. and Y.M.C.A. huts should receive from Church people generous and practical support, both financial and personal. But in every large parish I believe a Men's Service to be an essential part of parochial organization. Such a service should be held weekly and be of a manly and robust type.

(2) *Work among Women.*—I have referred elsewhere to the formation of the Diocesan Board for women's work. The excellent work of the Mothers' Union, of Mothers' Meetings, should be supplemented in large parishes by a bright and homely service for women held weekly. Such a service can be made of real value if only labour, trouble and tact are expended upon its success.

But important as are Evangelistic efforts inside the Church, they are by no means adequate for the Evangelization of the parish. We must not merely pray for "all sorts and conditions of men," but earnestly seek by such a variety of operations to reach and win them all for Christ. This is not done in many parishes. For instance, are efforts really made to help the blind, the deaf and dumb? Recently in a very small parish on the Sunday

evening I shook hands with five blind persons, each of whom was guided to and from church by communicants arranged by rota. This should not be an exceptional case, but the ordinary practice in every parish. It is more difficult to deal with the deaf and dumb, but every parish priest should have a list carefully prepared of all such persons in his parish. A male and female communicant should be asked to undertake the care of these people for Christ's sake. They should learn their alphabet, visit them in their homes, sit with them in church and interpret the service and sermon to them. Information and help concerning such work will be gladly given by the Rev. Albert Smith, 17A, Lumley Street, Oxford Street, W., if he is asked. Again, the poorer brethren in our asylums and workhouses ought to receive special attention. The chaplain ought not to be isolated from his brethren. They ought to offer him help. Choirs should be provided, and in every way his difficult task made lighter by sympathy and co-operation.

Open Air.—I believe that if the Church is to gain ground she must pay more attention to open-air propaganda, but this had better not be attempted unless the work can be well done. Nothing less than the best will suffice for the open air. The day has gone by for the open-air service to be left for young men to learn how to speak. There must be the best singing, the best speaking, the best organization if the open-air meeting is to

become a power for good. But it will repay all the trouble expended upon it.

Work among the Young.—The best place for Evangelistic effort to commence is at a mother's knee. It must be continued on every day in the week, in the home, in the day school, in the Sunday School and in the church.

Day Schools.—The question of religious education in the day schools is becoming increasingly important. We have seen that the more highly a State is educated the more powerful it is for evil, unless that increased power is regulated and controlled by morality and religion.

We do not wish for one moment to disparage the excellent work which has been done in county schools, nor to minimize the obligations under which their magnificent set of teachers have placed us. But at the same time we realize that the religious syllabus in county schools is uncertain and liable to alteration at any time.

Then, from the nature of the case, there is no guarantee that the teachers in the day schools have received the necessary training in religious subjects, or even are in sufficient sympathy with religious things, to become the teachers of religious faith. Further, they naturally are unable to give that aspect of religious truth which we value and desire so much.

Fortunately, there is in this Diocese a strong representative committee which has been considering the best means of increasing the efficiency of our

Church day schools. During the past year a new syllabus has been framed to take the place of the old syllabus of the National Society. It is based upon the principle that all religious education, if it is to have permanent results, must be clear in its aims, both to the teacher and to the child. Hitherto the instruction was liable to be vague and disconnected. The new syllabus has three very definite aims, viz., to teach the children—

(1) The Christian character.

(2) The source of power.

(3) The ideal of the Kingdom of God.

The new syllabus is published at the cost of one shilling, by Messrs. Tindall and Jarrold. Not only the clergy, but all those who have at heart the future of religious education, should purchase a copy and make themselves familiar with its main principles. In Essex at the present time, there are 270 Church of England Schools, and 329 departments in all. The total number of children on the books amounts to 33,765.

The cause of religious education has suffered a great loss in the death of the late Canon Andrewes. The work which he has laid down has passed into the able hands of the Rev. J. Berridge.

I must add a tribute of warm appreciation of the excellent work done by our Diocesan inspectors of Schools. From personal inquiry I realize how their visits to the schools, in the country areas especially, are of permanent value and are appreciated by clergy and laity alike.

I am certain there is a widespread and growing recognition of the importance of religious education. The proposals lately put forward by Mr. Fisher must receive careful and sympathetic consideration at the hands of Church people. They do not represent their policy, but at the same time they are less free from blemishes in past efforts of conciliation which Church people have felt obliged to reject. If the educational authorities give evidence that they are keenly alive to the necessity of causing religious teaching to be as *effectively* taught as any secular subject, then we as Church people will be willing to go a long way to forward the proposals, notwithstanding the many sacrifices which they will involve. But religious education is as necessary in secondary schools as in elementary, and must receive most careful consideration.

Secondary Schools and Pupil Teachers.—The work undertaken by Canon Sacre is that of organizing and stimulating religious teaching in secondary schools. Principals of secondary schools are encouraged to take up the Diocesan examination which is conducted twice a year by the Rev. J. H. Maude, of Pusey Rectory, Berks. A Division Divinity Prize is now awarded to the best candidate in every school which sends in ten candidates. During the last two years, Canon Sacre has visited many of the schools, particularly in Brentwood, Colchester and Southend.

The Principals would, in many cases, welcome their parish priest to give instruction in school if

given *regularly* and not spasmodically; *sympathetically* and not as a right.

Canon Sacre encourages bursars, pupil and student teachers to enter for the Archbishop's Religious Knowledge Examination which is held annually. Prizes and certificates are now given by the Diocese to successful candidates, with the result that last year fifty-five candidates entered from Chelmsford Diocese.

There are abundant signs, of which Mr. Fisher's Bill is one of great importance, that the secondary school system will count in the future far more than it has done in the past, and the Church must realize her great responsibility with regard to this matter. The Diocese ought, at an early date, to provide a good secondary school for girls. It is a reproach to our Church that the daughters of Church people should have to be sent to schools in connexion with other communions because of our failure to meet the need which is of such a real character. Is it impossible to raise a sum of ten thousand pounds for a purpose of such primary importance? If any one can enable us to carry through such a scheme they will be conferring a benefit upon the country, as well as serving the real interests of religion.

If Church people will act wisely, I am convinced that the nation is more favourably disposed towards the continuance of religious education than she was before the war. Germany has been a striking object-lesson of the evils of increasing the intellectual power of a people without a correspond-

ing increase of moral and spiritual power to control and guide it rightly. Therefore every opportunity must be taken to put the religious education in our day schools on sound and wise lines.

SUNDAY SCHOOLS.—The work in the day school must be supplemented by the Sunday School, and it is generally admitted that the Church is confronted at this critical juncture with the problem of raising the efficiency of her vast Sunday School system. At the present time there are 5,519 Sunday School teachers in the Diocese, to whom is entrusted the religious training of no less than 72,278 scholars. These figures suggest two serious considerations. On the one hand, they show the immense influence of the Sunday School upon the future generation. On the other hand, they reveal a sad, but steady decline in the numbers of both teachers and scholars. Contrast them with the figures for 1913. Then the corresponding figures were 7,022 teachers and 94,980 scholars. Thus in five years no less than 1,503 teachers and 22,704 scholars have been lost to the Church in this Diocese alone. Apart from this we have grave cause for anxiety in the failure of our Sunday Schools to attach our young people to the institutional life of the Church. Our Sunday Schools have failed to inspire them with love for the Church and her Sacraments and services. Nor is this all. For there is unanimous agreement in the evidence of reliable witnesses on the state of religion among the bulk of our lads in the Army, that their religious instincts lacked the training of

Christian teaching. Ignorance about the fundamental truths of the Christian faith was most lamentable. Above all, they had never been taught to worship. The cause is not difficult to find. The efficiency in the religious training of children has not kept pace with the improved method of modern secular instruction. Too often this important work has been left to young untrained teachers, whose lack of knowledge of how to teach and of child-life has not been counterbalanced by the stability of Christian character, which has often triumphed over defects of learning or method. The influence of the great army of men and women who have given years of consistent teaching and Christian example in our Sunday Schools cannot be overestimated.

The Sunday School must be made as efficient as possible, and the first effort in this direction should be to improve the status of the teacher. Men like Lord Hatherley, Earl Cairns and Earl Selborne continued their Sunday School work while holding the position of Lord Chancellor, and the co-operation of men and women of education as teachers should be secured if it is at all possible. The teachers' preparation class should receive careful attention, and the model lesson should be for children of a medium age, and the teachers should be shown how it can be extended to suit older children, and also adapted for the younger.

Speaking generally, the weakness of Sunday School teachers has been that they themselves needed teaching. Every parish priest owes it to his

teachers that he should teach them. If they are to be efficient they must know more than they impart. This is the great opportunity and responsibility of the clergy. It is reported by the Diocesan authorities that where the incumbent or one of the staff is keen on the efficiency of the Sunday School there is no falling off in the numbers.

The Chelmsford Diocesan Sunday School Council, of which the Bishop of Colchester is the chairman and the Rev. J. Holyoak is secretary, exists to increase the efficiency of the Sunday School in every parish in the Diocese. Miss Hunt, their trained organizer and visitor, is prepared to visit parishes either on Sundays or weekdays, to inspect Sunday Schools, to give instruction to teachers, and to advise superintendents as to books and methods. In populous centres it is sometimes possible to have a "training week," with lectures and demonstrations. But shorter visits can be arranged, and the Council do not want any parish to hesitate to claim Miss Hunt's services on the ground of its smallness or remoteness. Yet the Visitation returns show that, while it is gratifying to see the extent of her work, there are still a large number of parishes where she has not been consulted, nor is any instruction given to the teachers. Sometimes the answers betray a mistrust of innovation and up-to-date methods, and a query as to its practicability, but where Miss Hunt has visited this has usually been replaced by welcome acceptance of the "modern" methods.

The Diocesan Council has already formed eleven local associations in different deaneries, and regards these as the surest way to stimulate increased interest and activity.

Training classes are organized annually. Last year a very successful one was held at Brentwood. In addition to this, the Rev. G. A. Campbell and the Rev. J. Holyoak are willing to take " quiet days " for Sunday School workers.

There must be an increased recognition of the vital importance of Sunday School work on the part of Church people generally. At present, while the need of efficient Sunday Schools becomes more pressing, the supply of earnest and competent teachers diminishes. We have much to learn from the North of England and her pride in the Sunday School. Its hold upon the adolescent is such that they continue in their attachment during their teens and pass into classes of grown-up men and women.

There should be no disposition to supplant the work of the Sunday School by the catechizing in Church. Both forms of instruction have their place and value. The one is the complement rather than the antithesis of the other. Probably the best results are obtained by attention being given to both systems.

But, in addition to work in the day and Sunday Schools, children should be enrolled in guilds and clubs. The Band of Hope should be retained, but its objective should not be merely that of training

the children in habits of temperance, but should include kindness to animals, missionary efforts, while the Girl Guides movement should be introduced and maintained in every parish. For the older girls, the G.F.S. should be maintained. Before leaving this subject, I regret that I cannot deal adequately with the important question of work among the children of the wealthier classes. It is of immense importance, and I hope that at an early date it may be brought before your notice.

Work in the Country Parish.—The priest in the country who ceases to engage in Evangelistic work is certain to degenerate, for he under-estimates the value and importance of his work. The clergyman in the country may have an influence greater and more permanent than his brother in the town. If the Church and all for which it stands were removed from the rural life of England, then England would be poor indeed. The history of both Church and State reveals the fact that the greatest men in each, the men who have really made England great, have been the children of the village rather than of the town. But the difficulty of the incumbent in the country is almost as great as that of his brother in the town, although very different in kind and degree. The country incumbent has to deal with small numbers of people, and thus is apt to miss the stimulus and enthusiasm begotten of large masses of people, but, on the other hand, he possesses the great advantage of being able to know all his people, their names, their occupations,

and a great deal concerning their life. He can form a rota for prayer, and on it can appear the names of every man, woman and child in his parish, and these can be brought before God regularly and systematically, and in this way he can become, in a very real sense, the intercessor of his people, and thus he possesses a glorious privilege fraught with unlimited possibilities. He can pray in every home in the village if he possesses tact. The time at his disposal will allow him to teach regularly in the little village school the story of the Christ, and every boy and girl can grow up in *personal* touch with him. He can study the peculiar temperament of each child, watch over them individually, and in a special sense bring them up in the fear and nurture of the Lord. Even if a Confirmation is not held every year in his parish he can hold a class annually, at which past and prospective candidates can attend. The village club, whether held in hut or room, can be visited each night, and the number of " functions " in a village is so limited that he can be the prime mover and guide of them all. The village priest has opportunities of personal dealing not possessed by any other Christian worker in the land. The services on Sunday could be made a real joy and help. With trouble the village orchestra can be restored, a small choir (of both sexes in the village) can be formed, hearty tunes introduced and the whole service made one really representative of the village. The sermon must be viewed seriously. The many volumes published of sermons preached

in country districts show what can be done in this respect. It may be said by some of you that your Bishop has no experience of work in such a parish and that I have underestimated their difficulties. But there are country parishes in which the Church is the centre of all its life, and where the vicar is to the people the kind of priest I have described. Surely " this kind cometh not by prayer and fasting," but come it can, if only the Priest " never ceases his labour," but tactfully and prayerfully aims at its accomplishment. Sometimes by means of " Pilgrims," and of Church Army " Flying Squadron," in addition to agencies set afoot by our Diocesan Home Mission Union to help our brethren in the smaller parishes. The Blessed Master loved the village, and His disciples were sent through those of the Holy Land. It was from the lily, the birds of the air and the harvest field that lessons were drawn which men are learning to-day, and happy is that pastor who finds in the village that interest which his Master felt, and who finds as he walks through it the One Who revealed Himself as the Christ in Bethany and Emmaus.

But whether in town or country, the ideal before each member of the Church, clerical or lay, is that clearly expressed in the Ordinal. Labour must never cease " until there is no room left for ignorance in religion nor for viciousness in life." The fact must be faced—conversions are rare. What would the result be if a private census was made in each parish as to the number of adults really changed in

life and practice in a year? Would it show any drunkards in January, communicants in December, or any men formerly habitual breakers of the Sabbath regular at the services of the Church? It is the absence of such "trophies" of grace which affords ground for grave anxiety. We are not casting out devils. Regularity at the Holy Communion is pressed, and rightly so, but the danger is great of the Church faring sumptuously every day and neglecting the Lazarus at her gates. If the Church is to become a real force in the land her methods must be readjusted. The number of clergy must be increased in large town parishes, but not in order to increase the number of celebrations, but for definite Evangelistic work. The custom of repeated celebrations the same day, with a mere handful of people at each celebration, is contrary to all Catholic practice and was condemned over and over again in the early days of the Church. Priest and people must make their great objective not the number of services, but the number of conversions obtained by hard work in the homes and haunts of men. Christ Himself led the way to this. He left the glorious worship of Heaven to come to a sin-stricken world, and He preferred to be at the foot of the hill healing the lad rather than be on the mountain-top worshipping in the tabernacle. The one hundred and twenty only went into the upper room to seek for power, and the moment they received it they were back again in the street preaching Christ and making converts.

Every baptism of power, every celebration, every Confirmation should be followed by some distinctly Evangelistic effort on the part of those thus blessed. To aim at the conversion of men for whom the "body was broken" and "the blood was shed" should be regarded normally as the completion of the service at which both are received. I ask that in every parish efforts should be made to carry out the real objective to which the Church is committed, the conversion of the souls of men. In such an effort the Church herself will be strengthened and God, even her own God, will bless her.

CHAPTER VI

THE BASIS OF ALL SUCCESSFUL WORK

WHAT saith the Lord? "Not by might (of an army, organization or society), nor by power (whether of individual capacity or work), but by my Spirit." Samson possessed physical strength, Solomon mental power, but both their lives ended in failure simply because they lost the highest power of all, the Holy Spirit. So with the Church. She may have large numbers of adherents, possess great wealth, be brilliantly organized, and yet He who knows may say, "Thou hast a name that thou livest and art dead." Unless the Church is "going into all the world," unless she is aggressive and not self-centred, she cannot claim or expect her Lord's Presence, for the promise of His Presence is bound up with, and consequent upon, her obedience to his command "Go," "Make." There is a great distinction between authority and power. They were meant to be combined in every Christian worker, but they are not in all cases. The Master gave His disciples authority, but they had themselves to seek for the power in the upper room.

It is manifestly true that the Church and her

members are not " casting out devils " and " raising the dead." The number of drunkards reclaimed and of prostitutes restored is lamentably few. This is a question of vital importance. God can dispense with the help of man in one sense, and yet in another He depends on human agency for the carrying out of His purpose. Every great movement in the Church has had behind it and in it, men with personality—St. Paul, Athanasius, Augustine, Luther, St. Francis, Wesley and Whitfield, Pusey and Keble. Their characteristics were different, their methods varied, but the Cross was the centre of their faith, and their power was that of the Holy Spirit. The Church can only find her power where her saints found theirs. What is wanted to-day is to find in every walk of life " men moved by the Holy Ghost." Not only must such men be found in the pulpit and prayer desk, but also at the forge, the bank, on the farm and in the factory. When once this is a normal condition then, and then only, will the Church become equal to her task. Not only must the clergy be the wholesome example to the flock of Christ, but also every disciple must be equally so. When the Church as a whole is composed of men and women who are really " a peculiar people " inasmuch as they reveal that their citizenship is in heaven, and when they show they are disciples of their Lord by " denying " themselves, and when they " have love one towards another," then, as in her early days, " the Lord will add daily to her such as shall be saved." The Church does not suffer most

from her members who fall into grievous sins. The general sense of the community and of the Church recognizes that such things grossly violate the spirit and teaching of the Church. But the Church does suffer severely from the low average of spirituality of many clergy and leading laymen. They lower the tone of the whole body, and therefore the call is for greater reality in faith, in holiness, and in the means of grace. We ought never to dissociate the growth of spiritual life from the two great Sacraments, baptism the Sacrament of admission, and the Lord's Supper as that of sustenance. The latter must be regarded by all Christians as their great means of grace. If Confirmation candidates have been carefully prepared on the lines I have suggested elsewhere, then the communicant, whether he be priest or layman, will have learned to draw near and take the Holy Sacrament *to his comfort.* But Augustine's advice still stands: "If thou wouldst pray well in the temple, learn first to pray well in thy closet." The communicant or worshipper who neglects private prayer and private communion with his Lord can never expect to gain in the public services of the Church that strength and grace which they so greatly need. For the growth and development of the Christian life, in addition to the public services of the Church, may I plead for—

(1) PRIVATE PRAYER AND INTERCESSION.—This is all-important. Important for the priest and important for the laity. But as a preparation for both I urge meditation. One of the greatest de-

fects in modern Christian life is the lack of contemplation and meditation. The clergy should consider the question from the point of view of the growth of spiritual life within themselves, and then urge it upon their people. This course will increase the value of prayer manifold. For this purpose the retreat movement is most valuable. I was thankful that in 1916 over six hundred priests went into retreat, and also for the real benefit which is being derived from the Retreat House at Pleshey, but I hope that more and more attention may be paid to this real help in the spiritual life. Private prayer is essential. However busy the priest is, he has promised to be "diligent in prayer" and "to pray earnestly." It is his duty as well as privilege, but he should pray in order that he may teach his people the better to pray. Prayer, persistent and continuous, is not always easy, especially to people of certain temperaments, and therefore it is advisable that directions and aids to private prayer should be freely given in sermons. Sermons are needed not merely on the necessity for, and benefit of, prayer, but on *how to pray*. But the prayer of clergy and laity must follow our Lord's example and become intercessory. How few people really pray in an orderly way, with a system, for persons and things beyond their personal relations and friends. Intercession paves the way for unity and harmony. Many a priest can benefit his people more when on his knees than when in the pulpit.

(2) FAMILY PRAYER.—Is this increasing or de-

creasing ? It is becoming more difficult owing to the altered conditions of life, but it is all-important. It may be helpful if clergy would preach upon this subject, recommend different kinds of manuals of Family Prayer, some of which might be put on the Church bookcase as samples in order to help people in their selection of one for use. The open church cannot supplant the family altar without serious loss. Cards of a simple character containing prayers suitable for working-class homes, in town or village, are issued by the Diocese, and specimens can be obtained from Tindall and Jarrold, Chelmsford.

(3) Reading and study of Holy Scriptures.—On the second Sunday in Advent we pray that we may " read, learn and inwardly digest " that which is found in Holy Scriptures. The priest promises at his Ordination to " be diligent " in reading the same. It is to one who " is a learned and discreet minister of God's Holy Word " that the troubled believer is to turn in the hour of trouble. We realize how strongly the Church emphasizes the study of Holy Scripture. But we must remember that the devotional and religious study of the Bible is something quite different from its historical and theological study. They are connected, it is true, but the methods are different. It is a great temptation to the minister to read the Bible as a textbook from which to draw sermons, whereas, if even that is to be done thoroughly, the Bible must be to him something far more. It must be the Word of God to him-

self. It must be at once the sword, the balm and the food of God being used by God to wound, to heal and to feed. The clergy must realize this in their own lives. Men must be taught how to use the Bible as our Lord used it in the daily battle of life. One reason why so few people really love to read the Bible is because it has never been to them a book to which they have been taught to turn for comfort, for guidance and for strength when engaged in the common round and trivial task. I urge upon all the importance of the daily reading of Holy Scripture.

I must now turn to two subjects of a controversial nature, and yet both subjects of great importance to thousands of Church people, viz., "Confession" and "Fasting."

CONFESSION.—This subject has been the cause of much controversy. On the one hand it is urged that Confession as understood in the Roman Church is enjoined in the Exhortation in the Communion Office, while, on the other hand, any attempt to carry out, even in the simplest form, this direction is viewed with suspicion as tending to introduce the "Confessional" into our Church life. I have expressed my views on this question so fully on other occasions that I now only would say :—

1. A comparison between the words in the "First" Prayer Book and our own clearly shows, by the number of words altered, substituted and omitted, that the compilers intended that a real change of practice was contemplated, and that the troubled soul was

to be helped and led into peace by a " discreet and learned minister of God's Holy Word " and by " the ministry of God's Holy Word." The word " minister " was substituted for " priest," and in 1662 the proposal to reverse this decision was defeated. These and similar alterations are frequently overlooked. If they were clearly and honestly studied, I think it would be seen—

(*a*) Whatever the words in the Exhortation may mean, they do not relate to the normal, but rather to the abnormal condition of the life of the communicant. Habitual and frequent resort to the " minister " is not intended. Ordinarily the communicant is to prepare his own heart for the Holy Communion, but a special means of help is provided, in special circumstances, when his own efforts fail to bring him peace. If I were minister of a large church in which " Confession " was taught, I should be compelled to examine myself and my teaching very thoroughly if I found the number of those coming " to open their grief " was large. A large number of " Confessions " suggests that there may be something amiss which does not enable communicants to say, " we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Primitive practice and Anglican teaching are both in favour of *very few* " *Confessions*."

(*b*) That whatever the words may mean, that for which they stand is not compulsory, but entirely voluntary. There is not the slightest authority for urging " Confession " as a compulsory duty either

before Confirmation or Communion or at any other time.

(*c*) That the person to whom the burdened soul comes for help should be of mature age and possessing such an experience as to be likely to be of real help to those seeking it. The very words "discreet" and "learned" imply this. It is most unwise from every point of view to entrust this work to every priest, however young and inexperienced he may be, simply because he is in Holy Orders. I hope that incumbents will exercise the greatest care with regard to the men to whom they apportion this part of ministerial duty. It is one fraught with possibilities of great evil, and no priest should undertake such work simply because he is a priest.

(*d*) That the minister *must* afford opportunities for any burdened soul to come and "open his grief." In many parishes no such facilities are given, although communicants have a right to receive them. The Prayer Book does take serious notice of the demand of the soul, when in doubt and trouble, to receive help and assurance, and no fear of being thought to tamper with the "Confessional" should prevent a parish priest from putting a notice on his church boards as to when he can be seen. It is well that such notice should be in the words used by the Prayer Book and not those which are largely used by another communion. If rightly used as the Prayer Book intends, such interviews can be made of real help to the growth and development of the Christian life.

2. FASTING.—Fasting is not merely a Roman practice. It is something more. It was both taught and practised by our Lord, and therefore the Church has always regarded it as a means of grace to be used by all Christian people. The wise pastor will endeavour to present the true ideal of fasting to his flock as it was understood in the New Testament and practised in the Primitive Church. The Church of England clearly calls upon her members to fast, but leaves them entirely unfettered as to the method by which the rule is to be observed. It may be well therefore to point out:

(1) That in the Primitive Church fasting meant much more than mere abstinence from food. The Fathers realized that in both the Old and the New Testament the Saints as well as their Lord abstained from both food and drink for certain periods, and that their example was one to be followed, but they taught that fasting meant much more than this. Quotations as to their teaching might easily be multiplied, but the following may be said fairly to represent the teaching of the Primitive Church on the subject. St. Gregory the Great writes: "Fasting consists not merely in strict abstinence from lawful food, but in entire separation from sinful practices, and in the hearty doing of right things. If thou seest an enemy, be reconciled to him; if thou seest a poor man, take pity on him; if thou seest a neighbour prospering, thank God for him." St. Basil said: "The true fast is estrangement from evil." This aspect of fasting should never

be overlooked. To dwell unduly on abstinence from food will tend to lower the ideal of a true fast and to limit the benefits to be derived from it.

(2) That the Church of England lays down *no* rules as to the methods by which the fasts enjoined for Wednesdays, Fridays or the Lenten period are to be observed. The substitution of fish for meat at these seasons may be a fast to some, while to others it may be an agreeable change rather than an act of self-denial, and therefore the Church demands no observance of this or any other custom. Her members are left entirely free to choose as to *how* they will keep the fast.

(3) In accordance with primitive practice the Church of England nowhere enjoins the compulsory reception of the Holy Communion while fasting. Although fasting before baptism was common and in many places practically compulsory, the first clear injunction concerning the fast before Holy Communion is that of local African Councils in 397 which forbids a presbyter to celebrate if he has lunched or dined. This did not rule out the early and simple meal. In 1893 the Upper House of Convocation for Canterbury passed the following resolutions on the subject :—

" That at the Reformation the Church of England, in accordance with the principle of liberty then laid down, ceased to require the Communion to be received fasting, though the practice was observed by many as a reverent and ancient custom, and as such is

commended by several of her eminent writers and divines down to the present time."

"That regard being had to the practice of the Apostolic Church in this matter, to teach that it is a sin to communicate otherwise than fasting is contrary to the teaching and spirit of the Church of England." That this was Dr. Pusey's view is clear from the following letter from his pen: "I think that the subject of fasting Communion is pressed very unduly upon people's consciences by some, so as to set an ancient custom of the Church against our Lord's command in some cases. No one could doubt that early and fasting Communion is the most devotional; the poor feel this. The question arises, when any do not feel themselves sick enough to ask habitually for sick Communion at an early hour, and yet it is impossible for them to go out without manifest risk of health or life; or (as is often the case in the country) Holy Communion could only be had at a very late hour, with the same risk, though they be well.

"Midday Communions used to be the rule among us. The early Communions of late years date from the revival of about 1833, except on great festivals in towns. And it is a difficulty affecting thousands of clergy throughout the country. I suppose it would, in many cases, be a question between non-fasting Communion and death.

"When asked I have been wont to begin at the beginning:—

"(*a*) There is no irreverence in non-fasting Communion, else:—

"(1) Our Lord would not have instituted it after eating the Passover, for He was Lord of both Covenants, and it was of His own will that He so connected them.

"(2) The Viaticum is everywhere administered after food, but no one would make the last Sacrament an act of irreverence.

"(*b*) There is no binding law. I cannot here look over books, but I remember seeing it in the hand of a learned Roman Catholic.

"(*c*) It is, then, a very early and religious custom, originating in such abuses as those at Corinth, yet not without exceptions. Bishop Forbes, who had such varied learning, told me that it had been the custom to allow Kings of France and Spain to communicate non-fasting, because it was thought edifying to their subjects to see their Kings communicate. The Christmas midnight Mass at some chapel at Rome was or is celebrated (I forget for what reason) an hour before midnight.

"(*d*) There is no difference in principle between communicating at the midnight Mass on Christmas night when, e.g., Christmas Day is on a Monday, and on the Sunday full meals have been allowed, and taking food at an early hour on the same day. For the division of the twenty-four hours is, of course, wholly artificial.

"(*e*) In some cases at least there should be a direct conflict between our Lord's command and the observance of the pious custom. Whether the 'This do in remembrance of Me' be or be not addressed

primarily to the priest it must include the people. Frequent Communion is the life of the soul: prolonged abstinence would be starvation. The Easter Communion is accounted the very least which would fulfil our Lord's command.

"The rigid rule which is laid down by some now, that non-fasting Communion is to be avoided as mortal sin, would in very many cases clash with our Lord's command to communicate.

"I wish the young clergy were less free with the words 'mortal sin.' It would not, according to their showing, be mortal sin in their people unless they made it so. For a person cannot fall unknowingly into mortal sin. I suppose they place the mortal sin in contravening the positive law of the Church. I wonder whether they themselves think that they commit mortal sin whenever they omit saying the Daily Service. 'Mortal sin,' is, as you know, what kills the soul at one blow. Do they mean that one who communicates non-fasting kills the soul? . . .

"I believe that non-fasting Communion comes under our Blessed Lord's rule, 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice,' and I feel sure that if He were here He would dispense with the custom Himself in many cases; as of the weakly. I am certain that He would rather they communicated non-fasting than were starved.

"Fasting Communion is, I believe, a pious custom to be aimed at and commended, not one to be enjoined under penalty of mortal sin. This is bewil-

dering to me, and would, I should think, confuse in people's minds the thought of sin altogether.

"I need not say that we old Tractarians communicated and communicate fasting, but we cannot lay the burden on the shoulders of the weak or sickly."

These words by Dr. Pusey are well worth consideration, and hence I give them in full. From them and the resolutions passed by Convocation it is conclusive that if a person finds that by coming fasting to the Holy Communion he is helped to obtain a greater spiritual conception of Christ, he should be advised so to communicate, but on the other hand the teaching of compulsory fasting Communion can have no place in a Church which uses in its prayer of Consecration the words, "*After* supper He took the cup." The Church lays down no rule on this question either in the list of "Fasts" or elsewhere. Each communicant is left entirely free to follow that practice which he finds most beneficial to the building up of the spiritual life. While, however, avoiding these somewhat side issues, the parish priest will do well to teach clearly the duty of fasting in its full meaning of self-denial. The age is rapidly becoming tainted with softness, luxury, and the abandonment of all restraint, and it is therefore most important that the Church should teach moderation in, and for certain periods abstinence from food, together with any other restraint which may tend to bring the body into subjection. Fasting in some way or another is an essential of the

Christian life, and as such must be taught and encouraged.

Finally, my brethren. The last public words of Archbishop Benson: "Be spiritual, be spiritual, be spiritual," are the words with which I would close my Charge. The two-fold Divinity within is our only hope and strength. The Indwelling Christ and the Holy Spirit within makes our body in a double sense the Holy "Temple of God." Thus, indeed, "they that be with us are more than they that be with them." Great and numerous are the foes of the Church, but if her members live by faith in their ever-present Lord, victory will be hers, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against her." So let us all return, either to the busy town or to the quiet country hamlet, strong in Him Who is the Resurrection and the Life and Who in His own good time will make all things new. I ask you to "go out with joy, and be led forth with peace: for the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands. Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree: and it shall be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off."

Printed in Great Britain for Robert Scott, *Publisher*, Paternoster Row, London, *by* Butler & Tanner, Frome

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

BY THE

BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD

J. E. WATTS-DITCHFIELD, D.D.

.. THE ..

CHURCH IN ACTION

2s. 6d. net.

Dr. S. A. DONALDSON, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, in his Introduction, *says* :—

" The lectures are not only full of deep spirituality and true earnestness, but are also eminently practical, sane, wide-minded, enriched with apt illustrations."

Standard :—" Not only deeply spiritual and genuinely earnest, but full of wise counsel and valuable advice. . . . Rich in apposite illustrations and quaint anecdotes. . . . Valuable lessons for those engaged in pastoral work."

Church Family Newspaper :—" This is a live book—sane and thought-provoking. . . . The appeal is made not only to the clergy, but to every person who feels the burden of souls—all will find in *The Church in Action* guidance and stimulus for which he will be thankful. . . . The book is unlike any work on Pastoral Theology we have read. . . . Intensely human."

British Weekly :—" Deserves to be studied by all Christian workers. The advice is thoroughly practical."

Record :—" Practical workaday thoughts and suggestions—a rich storehouse of treasure."

London: ROBERT SCOTT, Publisher,
Roxburghe House, Paternoster Row, E.C.

Record :—" Churchmen cannot be too thankful for such teaching."

HERE AND HEREAFTER

By the Right Rev.

J. E. WATTS-DITCHFIELD, D.D., LORD BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD.

3s. 6d. net.

Church Times :—" Mr. Watts-Ditchfield has some excellent lessons to enforce, as in those chapters which deal with the civic duty of the Churchman, and in that which deals with the real difficulty in finding candidates for the ministry of the Church. The book is good—a welcome evidence of advance."

Guardian :—" This volume makes it easy to understand the influence Mr. Watts-Ditchfield exercises in the East End of London, and in a far wider area. . . . He has laid the men of his own time who live and think under contribution. . . . Mr. Watts-Ditchfield exemplifies what is coming to be the most vigorous and effective type of the Anglican Priest. . . . His book is plain, sensible and cogent, and full of manly earnestness."

Record :—" The closing sermons, which deal with 'After Death,' are intensely solemn and moving. They deal with many questions connected with life after death, and in these pages will be found light and leading. Mr. Watts-Ditchfield's style is fresh, open, frank and unconventional. He quickly gets to the heart of things."

London: ROBERT SCOTT, Publisher, Roxburghe House, Paternoster Row, E.C.

LIBRARY OF
HISTORIC THEOLOGY

EDITED BY

THE REV. WM. C. PIERCY, M.A.

Each Volume, Demy 8vo, Cloth, Red Burnished Top, 7s. 6d. net.

THE CATHOLIC CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH.
By the Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D.

THE PRESENT RELATIONS OF SCIENCE AND RELIGION.
By the Rev. Professor T. G. Bonney, D.Sc.

ARCHÆOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.
By Professor Edouard Naville, D.C.L.

MYSTICISM IN CHRISTIANITY.
By the Rev. W. K. Fleming, M.A., B.D.

COMMON OBJECTIONS TO CHRISTIANITY.
By the Rev. C. L. Drawbridge, M.A.

RELIGION IN AN AGE OF DOUBT.
By the Rev. C. J. Shebbeare, M.A.

THE RULE OF WORK AND WORSHIP.
By the Rev. R. L. Ottley, D.D.

THE RULE OF LIFE AND LOVE.
By the Rev. R. L. Ottley, D.D.

THE RULE OF FAITH AND HOPE.
By the Rev. R. L. Ottley, D.D.

MARRIAGE IN CHURCH AND STATE.
By the Rev. T. A. Lacey, M.A.

CHRISTIANITY AND OTHER FAITHS.
By the Rev. W. St. Clair Tisdall, D.D.

THE BUILDING UP OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.
By the Rev. Canon R. B. Girdlestone, M.A.

THE CHURCHES IN BRITAIN. *Vols. I and II.*
By the Rev. Alfred Plummer, D.D.

CHARACTER AND RELIGION.
By the Rev. The Hon. Edward Lyttelton, M.A.

THE CREEDS: Their History, Nature and Use.
By the Rev. Harold Smith, M.A.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF ST. PAUL (Hulsean Prize Essay).
By the Rev. S. Nowell Rostron, M.A.

MISSIONARY METHODS, ST. PAUL'S OR OURS?
By the Rev. Roland Allen, M.A.

EDUCATIONAL PRINCIPLES AND MISSIONARY METHODS. By the Rev. Roland Allen, M.A.

"The 'Library of Historic Theology' is a project of great promise. Several volumes by eminent writers have already appeared and the issue of such a series amply demonstrates that there is no decline in the interest felt all through the ages in theological literature."—*Homiletic Review.*

Further important announcements will be made in due course; full particulars may be obtained from the Publisher, Robert Scott, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

D-8740
5-20
CC

BX
5034
J3
1920

Watts-Ditchfield, J E Bp.
Chelmsford.
The church and her problems; being the charge at his primary visitation. London, Scott, 1920.
vii, 189p. 19cm.

1. Church of England--Pastoral letters an charges. I. Title.

CCSC/mmb

023607